National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Services des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 86/01)

Canada

58

0-315-26791-7

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division | Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

FORREST, Iris Darlene

Date of Birth — Date de naissance	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
18 June 1939	Canada

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

5107 - 126 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T6H 3W1

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

The Teacher Perceiver Interview as an Instrument to Identify Nursing Instructors who develop Positive Teacher-Student Relationships.

University — Université

University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Ph. D.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
1983	Dr. H. Zingle

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date	Signature
July 11, 1983	I M Forrest

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW AS AN INSTRUMENT TO IDENTIFY NURSING INSTRUCTORS WHO DEVELOP POSITIVE TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

by

© IRIS DARLENE FORREST

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1983

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR IRIS DARLENE FORREST

TITLE OF THESIS THE TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW AS AN INSTRUMENT TO IDENTIFY NURSING INSTRUCTORS WHO DEVELOP POSITIVE TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED FALL, 1983

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) I. D. Forrest

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

5107 - 126 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T6H 3H1

DATED July 11 1983

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW AS AN INSTRUMENT TO IDENTIFY NURSING INSTRUCTORS WHO DEVELOP POSITIVE TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS submitted by IRIS DARLENE FORREST in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY.

.....
Supervisor

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

External Examiner

Date..June..10..1983.....

To all teachers who help others find their own wisdom.

"The teacher ... gives not of his wisdom but rather of his faith and lovingness. If he is indeed wise he does not bid you enter the house of his wisdom, but rather leads you to the threshold of your own mind."

Kahlil Gibran

"You cannot teach a man anything. You can only help him discover it within himself."

Galileo

Abstract

Purpose: This research was carried out for the major purpose of validating the Teacher Perceiver Interview as an instrument that would identify nursing instructors who develop positive teacher-student relationships.

The Teacher Perceiver Interview, a 60 item structured interview comprising 12 themes, was developed by Selection Research, Incorporated, and designed to provide information about a teacher's relations with others, particularly students.

Method: The 48 nursing instructors participating in the study represented the population from three hospital diploma schools of nursing. Each nursing instructor was interviewed with the Teacher Perceiver Interview by the researcher, a certified Teacher Perceiver Specialist.

Criterion measures for validation of the instrument were student and director ratings of the instructors. A sample of 463 nursing students, who represented 91 percent of the total, completed a questionnaire on one to three instructors. Students completed the 40 item SRI Student Questionnaire which gave a mean rating score for each instructor. A total of 1162 questionnaires was completed. The three directors of the schools of nursing completed the 24 item SRI Questionnaire for Teacher Advocates on each of their instructors which gave a total rating score for each instructor.

Nursing instructor score on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and on the 12 themes was correlated with director total rating score and with student mean rating score. In addition, nursing instructor scores on the Interview were classified into effective and less effective categories and t-test procedure was applied to determine if differences were present in student rating and director rating. Analysis of variance was used to determine if there were differences between instructor performance on the Interview and instructor (a)clinical specialty, and (b)year level of instruction. As well, instructor performance was correlated with instructor age, teaching experience, and nursing experience.

Results: 1. Nursing instructor scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview showed a correlation coefficient of +.24 ($p < .05$) with student ratings and +.41 ($p < .01$) with director ratings. 2. Theme scores which correlated with student ratings were Mission +.32 ($p < .01$), Rapport Drive +.33 ($p < .01$), and Input Drive +.28 ($p < .05$); theme scores correlating with director ratings were Rapport Drive +.39 ($p < .01$), Input Drive +.33 ($p < .01$), and Listening +.26 ($p < .05$). 3. Instructors scoring in the effective range on the Interview were rated significantly higher by students ($p < .01$) and directors ($p < .01$). 4. Student and director ratings showed a correlation coefficient of .45 ($p < .01$). 5. Instructors teaching in first year scored significantly higher ($p < .10$, Scheffe procedure) on the interview than

third year instructors. 6. Instructor scores on the Interview showed a correlation coefficient of -.27 ($p < .05$) with instructor age.

Conclusions: 1. On the basis of director and student ratings the Teacher Perceiver Interview is a valid instrument to identify nursing instructors who develop positive teacher-student relationships. 2. As the age of nursing instructors increases there tends to be an association with lower scores on the Interview.

Acknowledgements

Warm thanks are extended to the following people who have contributed to the completion of this thesis:

Dr. Harvey Zingle for initiating my interest in the research topic and for being one of the most consistently constructive people I have encountered;

Dr. Hugh Savage for his time, interest, and graciousness in serving as External Examiner;

Dr. Amy Zelmer for providing a nursing perspective and for her continuing interest in my academic progress;

Dr. John Paterson for his insightful and helpful critiquing of the thesis;

Dr. Bill Hague and Dr. Don Sawatzky for their thoughtful comments on the thesis and for the significant contribution of each to my personal and professional development during graduate work;

The instructors, students, directors and co-ordinators of the schools of nursing who expended time and energy to help make the study a reality;

Judy and Olive, dear friends and supportive colleagues;

Bob, my husband, an uncommonly fine and generous man.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 1
INTRODUCTION 1
Background of the Problem 1
Purpose of the Study 3
Significance of the Study 5
Overview of the Study 6
CHAPTER II 8
REVIEW OF LITERATURE 8
Hospital Diploma Programs in Nursing 8
Characteristics of hospital programs 9
Comparison with other programs 10
Significance of hospital programs 11
Selection of nursing faculty 13
Development of nursing faculty 15
Evaluation of nursing faculty 16
Teacher-Student Relationships 18
Relevance to effective teaching 18
Nature of the relationship 21
Role of faculty 23
Perspectives on evaluation 25
Student ratings 27
The Teacher Perceiver Interview Process (TPI) 29
Development of the process 29
Use of the process 32
Validation research 33

Student and administrator ratings 33
Administrator ratings 36
Student ratings 36
Summary of validation research 37
Other Research 38
Summary of Literature Review 39
Hypotheses 40
Nursing Instructor Performance 40
Hypothesis 1 41
Hypothesis 2 41
Relationship of Ratings 41
Hypothesis 3 41
TPI Themes and Items 41
Hypothesis 4 41
Hypothesis 5 42
Hypothesis 6 42
Effective and Less Effective Performance 42
Hypothesis 7 42
Hypothesis 8 42
Questions 43
Question 1 43
Question 2 43
Question 3 44
CHAPTER 3 45
METHOD 45
Sample 45
Instruments 46

Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI) 46
SRI Student Questionnaire 52
SRI Questionnaire for Teacher Advocates 53
Procedure 53
Information to participants 53
Instructor data 54
Interview procedure 55
Questionnaire procedure 56
Inter-rater reliability 57
Certification of interviewer 57
Limitations and Delimitations of the Study 58
CHAPTER 4 60
RESULTS 60
Major Results 61
Hypothesis 1 61
Hypothesis 2 62
Hypothesis 3 63
Hypothesis 4 63
Hypothesis 5 66
Hypothesis 6 66
Hypothesis 7 75
Hypothesis 8 76
Summary of Results 77
Subordinate Results 78
Question 1 78
Question 2 81
Question 3 83

Summary of Results 85
Descriptive Results 85
Comparison of Teacher Perceiver Interview Means ..85
Student Questionnaire Analysis 88
Director Questionnaire Analysis 89
Instructor Response to Interview 90
CHAPTER 5 92
CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION 92
Conclusions 92
Practical Implications 96
Theoretical Implications 98
Further Research 100
REFERENCES 102
APPENDIX A: SRI STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE 112
APPENDIX B: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (ADAPTED) 114
Appendix C: SRI QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHER ADVOCATES 118
APPENDIX D: DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE (ADAPTED) 121
APPENDIX E: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW 124
APPENDIX F: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE 128
APPENDIX G: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE 131
APPENDIX H: TABULATION OF NURSING INSTRUCTOR RESPONSE TO TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW 134
APPENDIX I: CONSENT FORMS FOR INSTRUCTORS, DIRECTORS, AND STUDENTS 139

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1.	Sources of Alberta Nursing Graduates	12
2.	Educational Characteristics of Actively Registered Nurses in Alberta	13
3.	Coefficients of Correlation Between Teacher Perceiver Interview Scores and Ratings of Nursing Instructors	62
4.	Coefficients of Correlation Between Teacher Perceiver Interview Theme Scores and Ratings of Nursing Instructors	65
5.	Numerical Scores Assigned to the Correlation Coefficients for Individual Questions on the Teacher Perceiver Interview	70
6.	Teacher Perceiver Interview Questions Considered Predictive in Identifying Nursing Instructors	74
7.	Coefficients of Correlation Between Revised Teacher Perceiver Interview Scores and Ratings of Nursing Instructors	75
8.	*t*-Test on Student Rating Means for Nursing Instructors with Teacher Perceiver Scores in Two Ranges	76
9.	*t*-Test on Director Rating Means for Nursing Instructors with Teacher Perceiver Scores in Two Ranges	77

Table	Description	Page
10.	Teacher Perceiver Interview Characteristics of Nursing Instructors in Different Clinical Specialty Groups	80
11.	Analysis of Variance Between Nursing Instructors in Different Clinical Specialty Groups	80
12.	Teacher Perceiver Interview Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Nursing Instructors in Different Year Levels	82
13.	Analysis of Variance Between Teacher Perceiver Interview Mean Scores for Nursing Instructors in Different Year Levels	82
14.	Coefficients of Correlation Between Teacher Perceiver Interview Scores and Nursing Instructor Characteristics	84
15.	Comparison of Theme Scores for Female Normative Sample and Study Group	87
16.	Student Questionnaire Mean Scores	89
17.	Director Questonnaire Scores	90

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Helping professions to-day are striving to deal with the problems confronting them in this era of speed and technology, and in doing so, find meaning in their work. Nursing is no exception. In her analysis of the problems facing nursing, Smith (1976) contends that a major issue is the stress nurses must cope with in the work setting. Inability to cope with the stress frequently leads to burnout and the accompanying disillusionment with the practice of nursing. To begin to deal with the problem, according to this author, we must teach students in their initial nursing programs how to cope effectively with the stress that is part of nursing. Furthermore, it is up to faculty to help students develop the necessary skills, support systems, and values which will equip them to deal with a stressful work environment. That nursing education is a stressful and anxiety provoking experience for students is documented by McKay (1978) who suggests that the best way for faculty to help students deal with the stress is to develop positive and supportive interactions with students and to establish an "atmosphere which communicates that students are the most important priority in nursing

education" (p.391). Gunter (1969) also urges that nursing educators reduce student stress by establishing positive teacher-student relationships. The contention is that "the nursing student, through this experience of an understanding relationship with faculty, may be enabled to establish an understanding relationship or therapeutic relationship with her patients" (Gunter, 1969, p. 242). In support of the concept that nursing is a humanistic helping profession whose essence is care and caring, Watson (1981) points to the paramount importance of a learning climate in which the student herself experiences these conditions. Such experience is the precursor to the student internalizing the humanistic values basic to the profession of nursing (Ellis, 1970; King and Gerwig, 1981; Watson, 1981).

Positive teacher-student relationships have value then, for the student, the patient, and the profession of nursing. A problem that emerges is one of finding an objective, non-threatening, and inexpensive method whereby nursing instructors' orientations toward students can be accurately identified. An instrument which appears designed for this purpose, the Teacher Perceiver Interview, was developed on the premise that "the personalities and potentialities that a person brings to the field of teaching are critical elements in achieving excellence in teaching, and furthermore, that such qualities can be measured through a

systematic interview process" (Muller, 1978 b, p.2). More specifically, the Teacher Perceiver Interview was designed to provide information about a teacher's relations with others, particularly students, which in turn reflects the individual's beliefs and values, relating skills, and strategies chosen to activate learning.

What is the connection between a teacher's relationship ability and skills, and teaching effectiveness? There appears to be general agreement that effective teaching consists of both a content and a process dimension. Content expertise refers to the teacher's knowledge, presentation, and command of subject matter. Expertise in the process dimension refers to the teacher's skill in establishing positive working relationships with students that activate learning. While theorists and educators place different emphasis and priority on these dimensions, the developers of the Teacher Perceiver Interview state that both dimensions are equally important to effective teaching. The Teacher Perceiver Interview however is an instrument addressed to the process dimension and the area of teacher relationships with others (Selection Research, Inc., 1977a, pp 1-2).

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study is to determine if The Teacher Perceiver Interview is a valid instrument to identify nursing instructors who develop positive

teacher-student relationships. The validity of the instrument is derived from two external criteria, student ratings and school of nursing director ratings of the instructors. The following questions will provide the focus for hypothesis development.

1. Is nursing instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview related to ratings by the instructor's students and by the director of the school of nursing?
2. Is there a relationship between the ratings of directors and students for nursing instructors?
3. Which particular themes and items of the Teacher Perceiver Interview show a relationship to student and director ratings?
4. Is effective and less effective nursing instructor performance on The Teacher Perceiver Interview rated differently by students and directors?

A minor purpose of this study is to explore the relevance of particular nursing instructor characteristics to instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview. Questions for investigation are the following:

1. Do nursing instructors in different clinical specialties perform differently on the Teacher Perceiver Interview?
2. Do nursing instructors teaching in different year levels perform differently on the Teacher Perceiver Interview?

3. Is nursing instructor age, teaching experience, nursing experience, and education related to performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview?

Significance of the Study

The Teacher Perceiver Interview, an instrument developed by Selection Research, Incorporated, appears to have a successful record in identifying primary and secondary school teachers who establish positive working relationships with students. If the Interview has the same measure of success in identifying nursing instructors, there occur several specific and practical implications for administrators and directors of nursing education who have the responsibility for ensuring the quality of their nursing education program. Part of that quality assurance involves the development of faculty teaching effectiveness and the selection of effective faculty. Used as part of a selection procedure for hiring new nursing education faculty, the instrument may identify those instructors who would develop positive working relationships with students. Used as a faculty development tool nursing instructor strengths, in regard to teacher-student relationships, could be assessed and supported or further developed.

The investigation of particular nursing instructor characteristics and their relevance to instructor performance on The Teacher Perceiver Interview has the

potential to provide additional useful information for consideration in both the selection and development of nursing instructors.

In the broadest sense, investigation of the Teacher Perceiver Interview as an instrument to identify nursing instructors who develop positive teacher-student relationships has implications for nursing education and is of potential benefit to patients, students, and the profession of nursing.

Overview of the Study

In this first chapter of the thesis the background to the problem as well as the purpose and significance of the study has been introduced.

The content of Chapter 2 consists of a review of the literature with a focus on the following three areas: an overview of hospital-based diploma nursing education; the theory and research relating to teacher-student relationships including perspectives from both education and nursing; a compilation of the research relative to the Teacher Perceiver Interview process. The chapter concludes with a statement of the hypotheses to be tested and questions to be explored.

In Chapter 3, the methodology of the study is discussed which includes a description of the sample, instruments selected, and procedures used. Limitations and

delimitations of the study are indicated.

The results of the study are presented in Chapter 4 under the headings of major results, subordinate results and descriptive results. Analyses of the data are presented in a number of tables.

Chapter 5 concludes the study and consists of a presentation and discussion of the conclusions, a commentary on the practical and theoretical implications of the study, and suggestions for further research. References and appendices follow.

Where appropriate in the study, the writer has chosen to use feminine gender pronouns since by far the majority of participants in the study were female.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature related to the current research is focused on three main areas; an overview of hospital diploma programs in nursing, theory and research relating to teacher-student relationships, and a review of the research relating to the Teacher Perceiver Interview process. The chapter concludes with a summary followed by a statement of the hypotheses to be tested and the questions to be explored in this study.

Hospital Diploma Programs in Nursing

While there are different approaches to nursing education, the setting selected for this study reflects the hospital-based diploma program approach. For this reason it becomes important to describe and differentiate hospital diploma programs from other approaches to nursing education, and to provide evidence of the significance of these programs in the preparation of nurses in this province. As well, since the results of the study are presumed to have implications for the selection, development, and evaluation of nursing faculty, the literature is briefly reviewed in regard to practices in each of these areas.

This section then is focused on a description of hospital diploma programs in nursing; a comparison with other nursing programs; evidence of the importance of these programs; and a brief survey of practices relating to the selection, development, and evaluation of nursing faculty.

Characteristics of hospital programs. The philosophy of any educational program is influenced by the philosophy of the organization to which it is affiliated. A hospital-based diploma program in nursing is very much influenced by the hospital to which it is attached; the philosophy in a baccalaureate program is influenced by the university with which it is associated; and the philosophical background of a community college nursing program is strongly influenced by the community college of which it is a part.

Speaking in general terms, the philosophy of hospital-based diploma programs in nursing is geared to the delivery of a service to the community, that of caring for its acutely and chronically ill members. (Lombardo, 1978, p. 75). Consistent with the philosophy of service, the nursing student in a hospital program spends a good portion of her education providing care to and interacting with patients in the clinical setting. Generally, this clinical experience is obtained in the affiliated hospital with some outside agencies sponsoring specialized learning experiences

for students. This characteristic of extensive clinical experience is considered the hallmark of the hospital-based school of nursing.

Traditionally hospital-based schools of nursing have 'trained' nurses for practice settings and prepared the majority of nurses for this role. Today the hospital programs emphasize preparation for the role of general staff nurse and the development of knowledge and skills necessary to function as a nurse in a service-oriented role with the focus on the delivery of direct patient care (Lombardo, 1978).

Comparison with other programs. The extent of general nursing knowledge in the hospital-based nursing program tends to be wider than that of the community college program but not as broad as in the baccalaureate program (Lombardo, 1978). The baccalaureate program combines a liberal education in the arts and sciences along with the development of professional skills, a sense of professional direction, and a commitment to furthur education. Exposure to other disciplines outside of nursing is encouraged and required. The arts and science requirements of community college programs tend to be limited and deal primarily with the development of knowledge necessary to handle the tasks of nursing. The time for clinical learning experience is limited.

The baccalaureate graduate is prepared to identify problems of a broad scope in nursing and to lead in the planning, implementing, and evaluating of nursing care in a variety of settings. The community college graduate is prepared to recognize nursing problems of a technical nature and to plan, implement, and evaluate care on a day to day basis, initially under the supervision of a more experienced nurse (Lombardo, 1978).

Graduates of hospital-based programs and community college programs receive a diploma in nursing and are eligible for licensure as registered nurses. A graduate from a university program receives a baccalaureate degree in nursing and is eligible for licensure as a registered nurse, generally in her fourth year.

The student population in the community college nursing programs tends to reflect a wider age range than that found in the other programs. The shorter length of the college program and the greater flexibility for completing the program may be factors the mature student finds appealing.

Significance of hospital programs. In the province of Alberta, the following programs in nursing are available; two baccalaureate programs, six college diploma programs, and four hospital diploma programs. The baccalaureate programs are each four years in length, the college programs are, as of 1982, a minimum of 22 months (exclusive of

vacation), and the hospital programs vary between 24 and 32 months (exclusive of vacation). The number of graduates from each of the programs over the past three years is shown in Table 1. As noted in the Table, the greatest number of graduates in each of the three years has been from the hospital-based program.

Table 1*

Sources of Alberta Nursing Graduates

Institution	Year		
	1980	1981	1982
Hospital-based	296	326	285
College	228	201	171
University	91	55	67

*AARN Membership Statistics, October 5, 1982, p. 3.

Of interest, because of the broader picture presented, is Table 2 which depicts the initial type of nursing education and the educational level of actively registered nurses in Alberta. As indicated in the Table, by far the largest number of practicing nurses in Alberta are prepared in diploma programs, either hospital-based or college, and as well, the greatest number of nurses are practicing at the diploma level of preparation.

Table 2*

Educational Characteristics of Actively Registered Nurses In Alberta

Level	Education		
	Basic Nursing	Post-Basic Nursing	Post-Basic Non-Nursing
Diploma	17,029		
Bachelors	1,598	1,060	333
Masters		102	107
Doctorate		9	13

*AARN Council Statistical Summary, December 3, 1982, p. 19-20.

Selection of nursing faculty. Hiring faculty is an important responsibility in any school of nursing for the decisions made may have a lasting effect on students, faculty, the school, and the quality of patient care. It is also important that faculty be selected and promoted on the basis of "qualifications and performance" (National League for Nursing, 1977b, p. 11).

Directors of diploma schools of nursing devise selection policy and procedure, and in the case of college programs there generally is assistance in this task from the

personnel department. While the selection process varies between diploma schools of nursing it should include a variety of activities that identify the applicant's educational preparation, background of personal characteristics, and commitment to diploma nursing education (National League for Nursing, 1977b). Lombardo (1978) emphasizes the need for faculty in hospital-based diploma programs to have demonstrated expertise in interpersonal relationships because of the extensive opportunity for individualized clinical teaching and learning. This unique opportunity of one-to-one relationships is, in this author's opinion, a major means to helping students make application of learning, to reinforce learning, and to generally stimulate learning by responding to students as individuals. Authors deTornyay and Thompson (1982) are more emphatic when they state that the teacher, as a reinforcer of desired behaviors in students, is a critical force regardless of what specific content is taught or what learning setting is involved.

Approaches suggested in the selection of faculty include the use of formal application and transcripts, evaluative data concerning past performance, and personal interview with some measurable criteria. Whatever approaches are used, it is important that they provide "ample opportunity to formulate a conclusion about the

individual's potential contribution to the school and enable the applicant to determine whether the school provides the kind of environment in which he or she can best function" (National League for Nursing, 1977b, p. 11).

In the recruitment of nursing faculty for universities Hawken (1979) describes an organized and comprehensive procedure which helped the nursing faculty and potential faculty members, make informed choices. Also reported by one selection committee of a university faculty of nursing is an interview format which recommends that each candidate be asked predetermined questions even if the information is known from preliminary screening. Structuring the interview in this way allows for consistent questioning and comparison of applicants' views on specific issues (Bayne, Parker, & Todd, 1982).

Development of nursing faculty. Development programs in diploma schools of nursing appear geared to orientation needs of new instructors and to planned programs for faculty in areas that pertain to school and teaching responsibilities such as curriculum development, teaching methodology, evaluation techniques, and so on. It is stated, however, by the National League for Nursing (1977b) that in addition to programs planned for the entire faculty, "it is important that administration and faculty jointly consider ways in which individual development can be

fostered" (p. 15). Competence and effectiveness in teaching are not possible without a sincere desire on the part of the instructor to grow both personally and in professional knowledge and skill. At the same time, each school has a responsibility to maintain an environment and develop approaches whereby each instructor can identify individual growth needs to meet desired goals (National League for Nursing, 1977b, p. 25). Important for the instructor is her own self-evaluation, or self-assessment, of her skills, knowledge, and attitudes which provides an inventory of her strengths (National League for Nursing, 1977b, p. 41).

The evaluation process is, according to White (1978), one potential mechanism whereby each instructor can be helped to build on strengths and to utilize strengths to develop weak areas. Directors of nursing education and nursing instructors need to develop systematic and objective methods for assessing teacher effectiveness. An environment of openness and trust between director and instructor is critical to allow evaluation to be a positive force in the professional development of the instructor.

Evaluation of nursing faculty. One fundamental concern of nursing directors, students, and faculty is the evaluation of teacher effectiveness (National League for Nursing, 1977a). Formal and informal evaluation by administrators (Mufuka, 1978; Smeltzer, 1978; White, 1978)

peers (White, 1978; Wickless, 1978) and students (Duppstadt, 1978; Hastings, 1978; Smeltzer, 1978; Stadler, 1978) in both classroom and clinical teaching provide clues to instructor performance. An evaluation, is in fact, a value judgement based upon systematic observations and information about a person and the worth of that person's activities and behaviour (Wallace, 1978). The focus of evaluation is on whether the instructor's behaviour (her attitudes, skills, and knowledge) enabled the nursing student to meet the learning objectives in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. "The final measure of teaching effectiveness comes when the graduate of the nursing program successfully demonstrates to her employer the ability to meet the competencies identified in the objectives of the school" (National League for Nursing, 1977b, p. 41).

Considering faculty evaluation in a broader perspective, Smeltzer (1978) has found that professional and personal growth of faculty in a diploma program was augmented with the use of a systematic and objective evaluation tool specific to the functions and responsibilities of the teaching position. Directors of nursing education, students, and peers evaluate instructors according to behavioral objectives that measure the following four major areas of faculty responsibility:

1. Formulating, implementing, and evaluating their assigned

course(s).

2. Designing clinical learning experiences and supervising and evaluating students in the clinical area.
3. Participating in the improvement of the quality of the total nursing program.
4. Assuming responsibility for own professional growth (Smeltzer, p. 22).

Teacher-Student Relationships

Included in this section is a review of literature and research whose content and results have helped to define: the relevance of teacher-student relationships to effective teaching; the nature of an effective teacher-student relationship; the role of faculty in establishing an effective teacher-student relationship. Since both student and director evaluations or ratings of instructors are a major component of the study, literature and research related to the issue and outcome of teacher evaluation is included.

Relevance to effective teaching. In the seventeenth century Locke observed in Some Thoughts on Education, "the great skill of a teacher is to get and keep the attention of his scholar: whilst he has that, he is sure to advance as fast as the learner's abilities will carry him; and without that all his bustle and pother will be to little or no purpose" (Ulich, 1971, p. 378). Today, a similar

observation is made by nursing educators Richardson and Matheny (1978) who suggest the teacher's primary responsibility is to increase the learner's intention to learn which involves eliciting a positive, emotional response to the learning material and to the learning process. To arouse this positive response the teacher must give attention to four factors: the meaningfulness of the learning task, the degree to which the task involves the learner, the novelty of the learning task, and the extent to which the learner perceives that she is succeeding (Richardson and Matheny, p. 17). Each of these factors focuses on the teacher's perception of the individuality of each student and the development of a positive working relationship with each student to effect the desired response to learning. The degree to which teachers are able to motivate students seems to be tied to a set of attitudes and skills, on the part of the teacher, that communicate respect for the student as an individual. "Such attitudes are likely to include empathy, genuineness, positive expectations regarding students' performances, and cognitive flexibility stemming from security based upon competence" (Richardson & Matheny, p. 18).

In reviewing summaries of research investigating teacher traits, or characteristics, and learner achievement, the following variables seem to emerge consistently. These

variables are (a)enthusiasm, (b)clarity of organization, (c)criticism, which relates negatively to achievement, (d)businesslike attitude toward the task, (e)flexibility, (f)use of positive feedback, (g)use of student ideas, and (h)use of structuring comments (Rosenshine, 1976; Rosenshine & Furst, 1973; Shavelson & Dempsey-Atwood, 1976). The most consistent correlations between teacher traits and learner achievement were positive feedback and negative criticism which gives evidence to support the idea that positive feedback helps students achieve and, conversely, negative criticism is associated with low achievement. Trent and Cohen (1973) also report that students of teachers high in rapport performed better on measures of critical thinking versus lower-order knowledge than did other students.

The importance of the teacher-student relationship in the facilitation of learning and personal growth has been documented in the educational literature (Aspy & Roebuck, 1977; Combs, 1973; Pines, 1976; Rogers, 1969; Schmuck & Schmuck, 1974). Nursing education also declares value and ascribes importance to the need for humanistic teacher-student relationships. However, it is the opinion of some nurse educators that there is little nursing investigation into what constitutes an effective teacher-student relationship (Lombardo, 1978) and how nursing instructors can develop positive interactions with

students (Karns & Schwab, 1982; Sobol, 1978).

Nature of the relationship. Several nursing studies which have investigated effective teaching behavior, including examining teacher personality characteristics and/or teacher behaviors, have indicated the preeminence of relationship factors. One of the first nurse educators to attempt to study effective nursing instructor behavior in clinical and classroom instruction was Barham (1965) who identified 19 behaviors, 80 percent of which were related to interpersonal or relationship behaviors. In a later study on clinical teaching behaviors, O'Shea and Parsons (1979) found that university faculty and students, while differing in some of their perceptions, identified as effective those behaviors which were related to interpersonal skills including giving verbal encouragement, giving honest feedback, and being supportive. Ineffective behavior was identified as being impersonal, critical, and authoritarian.

Investigating characteristics of the effective classroom and clinical teacher Kiker (1973) asked baccalaureate nursing students to rank 12 teacher characteristics. Relationships with students was the characteristic ranked within the top quarter by students. Consistent with Kiker's findings are those of Brown (1981) who reported, in a study on clinical teaching effectiveness, that senior baccalaureate nursing students regarded the

instructor's relationships with students as most important while faculty rated professional competence as most important. In their study with nursing faculty and student perceptions of effective classroom teaching, Dixon and Koerner (1976) emphasized the importance of the relationship between teacher and student when they conclude "it is use of a particular way of dealing with people as well as quality of presentation, which students find most useful in describing teacher effectiveness" (p. 305).

To gain students' perceptions of teacher behaviors, in the clinical area, that promote positive teacher-student relationships, Karns and Schwab (1982) analyzed the responses from 31 junior baccalaureate nursing students and placed the behaviors into categories of empathy, congruence, and positive regard. Ninety-three percent of students identified behaviors reflecting empathy, 65 percent identified behaviors reflecting congruence, and 80 percent identified behaviors reflecting positive regard. In developing and testing an instructor evaluation form for diploma students, Duppstadt (1978) found the personal attributes of instructors cited most frequently by both junior and senior nursing students were patience and understanding.

A study focusing on the perspective of first year diploma nursing students revealed that those who rated their

relationship with their instructor as superior perceived significantly more empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness in the relationship (Forrest, 1978). Students participating in the study who reported their relationship with their instructor as superior described the relationship as one of openness and warmth in communication, peer transactions, and emotional closeness. Students reporting an inferior relationship described closed communication patterns, a lack of peer interactions, and an unfeeling, uncaring attitude on the part of the instructor. The results correspond with those of Rosendahl (1973) and Tyler (1964) who concluded that the individual teacher-student relationship involves "good or excellent communication in a peer relation which tends to be emotionally close" (Tyler, 1964, p. 116).

Role of faculty. A study which investigated the needs of senior baccalaureate nursing students, from their own perspective, showed that 71 percent of students felt they could relate to none or only one-quarter of the faculty; only 19 percent felt faculty encouraged intellectual curiosity and displayed a reasonable attitude toward disagreement (Stein, 1969). The results led the investigator to urge more reciprocal student-faculty interaction and more consideration by nursing faculty for student needs and conflicts. In relation to student

conflict, Gunter (1969), in her study of 120 second year baccalaureate nursing students, found the major concern of students was pressure of school work. Anxiety, nervousness, depression, and restlessness were present in the majority of the students though comparative data were not available which would indicate if such findings were significant. Gunter suggests the results have practical significance for nursing educators who must be assisted "to better understand the nursing student and thereby to establish more positive relationships with her" (p. 243). The finding of Brown (1981) and Kiker (1973) led both investigators to urge nursing instructors to develop interest in the student and her problems.

McKay (1978) documents the need for positive teacher-student relationships in nursing education programs and concludes that faculty are responsible for effecting the needed changes. Mitchell (1981) points out that current nursing literature is focused on the need for compassionate and self-aware nurses who are sensitive to patients' needs. The importance of role modelling this kind of behavior, which is consistent with the goals of nursing, is an important faculty responsibility (Archer, 1981). Students cannot be expected to achieve personal and professional goals, which include compassionate and involved nurse-patient relationships, if they do not experience

faculty demonstrating these behaviors in their relationships with students (Cotanch, 1981; Kunst-Wilson, Carpenter, Poser, Venohr, and Kusner, 1981). The quality of a nursing education program is, according to Schlotfeldt (1976), "directly related to the quality of its faculty" (p. 148). Zeroing in on the clinical aspect of the nursing education program Schweer and Gebbie (1976) pronounce that effectiveness is directly proportional to the kind of relationships teachers establish with students.

In confronting the idea that poor teacher-student relationships are harmful to the personal and professional development of the student nurse, Karns and Schwab (1982) attribute their existence to (a)lack of faculty preparation in interpersonal skills accompanied by the belief that clinical expertise automatically means teaching expertise, (b)a belief on the part of faculty that positive relationships with students means reducing expectations for performance, (c)lack of reward for the elusive quality of teaching excellence, and (d)recognition by faculty that involvement with students means expenditure of time, effort, and emotional energy.

Perspectives on evaluation. The relationship between a teacher and her students is one process that is part of the complex process that is called teaching. Effective teaching is described as the "relationship between the

characteristics of teachers, teacher acts and their effects on the educational outcomes..." (Flanders & Simon, 1969, p. 1423).

In determining the effectiveness of the teacher-student relationship, nursing students as consumers of education are indicating they want a voice (Armington, 1972; Hastings, 1978; Scheideman, 1973; Stadler, 1978). Students view learning experiences differently than faculty. For some aspects of the teaching-learning situation students are in a better position to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching strategies. Stadler (1978) maintains students not only want to be involved in the evaluative process but that students do evaluate objectively and offer important and useful suggestions for improved instruction.

Results of studies indicate that nursing students overwhelmingly want to evaluate teaching effectiveness but faculty express mixed feelings (Dixon & Koerner, 1976; Mims, 1970). Traditionally nursing faculty have questioned students' ability in making judgments (Dixon & Koerner, 1976) and have rationalized negative student evaluations (Karns &Schwab, 1982). Rather than becoming defensive, Scheideman (1973) suggests faculty interpret nursing student interest in evaluating teaching effectiveness as a desire to be more involved in their learning and their education. It is Duppstadt's (1978) belief that students in diploma

programs are genuinely concerned about the nature and quality of their education and as a result faculties "have a responsiblity to provide the opportunity for student involvement and sharing in the educational process" (p. 5). Specifically, Duppstadt suggests direct student involvement in the development of evaluation tools for courses and teachers. Such student participation, the author maintains, serves as a stimulus to improvement in both content and quality of the educational program.

Since there is a great deal of time and energy invested by faculty in the preparation and presentation of learning experiences for students, it becomes imperative to seek input from those most affected--the students--and to use this resource as one means to measure accomplishment (Hastings, 1978). For all nursing educators who are concerned with the implementation of a humanistic nursing education program it is necessary to recognize "the importance of 'tuning in' to the students' asking them for their perspective of the educational process" (McKay, 1978, p. 390).

Student ratings. Whether or not teachers want to be evaluated by students, student perception of effective teaching has become the type of data most often collected (Wallace, 1978). Further to this, Trent and Cohan (1973) suggest that on the basis of relatively plentiful research

student ratings of teacher effectiveness provide useful and reliable information about (a)a teacher's skill in terms of personal effectiveness, (b)the rapport a teacher has with students, and (c)the way a course or class is organized and managed.

In a review of evaluation on post-secondary teaching, Trent and Cohen (1973) outline five characteristics students consistently perceived as present in effective teachers. These characteristics are: (a)stimulation of students' interests, motivations, and thinking, (b)manifestation of attentiveness to and interest in students, (c)manifestation of enthusiasm, (d)encouragement of class discussion and the presentation of diverse points of view, (e)clarity of organization, interpretation, and explanation.

Summarizing the evidence over the past fifteen years in regard to student perceptions of teaching effectiveness, Wallace (1978) indicates similar factors that consistantly emerge. These factors are: (a)rapport between students and instructors, (b)commitment as a teacher, (c)skill at organizing and conducting a course, and (d)genuine interest in students' mastery of content.

Goldsmid, Gruber, and Wilson (1977) compared student perceptions of sixty award-winning faculty with sixty nonaward-winners and concluded that three factors were consistent in the award-winning group: (a)concern for

student mastery of course content, (b)enthusiastic treatment of subject matter, (c)genuine interest displayed in students as persons. In finding that students rated those college teachers who had previously been rated best by other criteria significantly superior on nine out of ten variables, Marsh (1977) concluded that his results "add to the growing amount of research supporting the validity of students' evaluations of instructional effectiveness" (p. 447). On the other hand, Shingles (1977) remains skeptical as to the validity of student perceptions in measuring teaching effectiveness, particularly when they are used as a sole criterion of evaluation.

The Teacher Perceiver Interview Process (TPI)

The major purpose of this study has to do with the validation of the Teacher Perceiver Interview as an instrument to identify nursing instructors who develop positive teacher-student relationships. It is necessary then to survey the literature and research regarding this relatively new instrument. The Teacher Perceiver Interview process is reviewed in relation to: the development of the process; current use of the process; results of validation research; results of other related research.

Development of the process. A review of the literature reveals that very little material has been published about the Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI). With

the exception of one journal article questioning the value of the TPI (Haefele, 1978) and an article defending its use (Muller, 1978a) the only other published material is in Dissertation Abstracts International. There are however a number of well documented validation studies that are available from Selection Research, Incorporated.

In the early 1950's, Clifton and others (1952) working with college counselors observed that successful counselors talked differently about their work with students and seemed to have different thought patterns. Counselors whose students viewed them positively talked about individuals while counselors whose students viewed them negatively talked more about procedures. Audiotapes of interviews with counselors perceived by their students to be successful or unsuccessful were collected and the thought patterns analyzed by psychologists. The interview method and analysis appeared useful in differentiating successful from unsuccessful counselors (Gaeddert, 1957). Application of the methodology was made to education and interview systems were constructed for teachers which would yield responses that could be scored (Bonneau, 1957; Dodge, 1963; Lieske, 1970; Warner, 1970; Winseman, 1969). The noted studies were the foundation to the TPI because they gave evidence that structured interviews with scored responses could be developed and were useful. Secondly, operational support

was presented for inclusion of teacher-student relationships in the criteria of effective teaching.

In the development of the original scoring standards for the TPI, students and educators were asked to name outstanding teachers they knew. These teachers were then interviewed and their responses analyzed for consistency of concept expressed. If responses to a question were consistent, the question was retained with the consistent response forming the scoring standard. The retained questions and the scoring standards developed were then administered to a new sample with results analyzed through standard test analysis procedures. The authors of the instrument indicate that the scoring standards are reflective of what teachers said rather than a philosophical or theoretical position.

The first edition of the TPI, in 1971, was field tested in four major school districts with the results providing the basis for the second edition. Since that time there has been little revision in the following editions including the fifth and latest edition introduced in 1977 (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1977a). The TPI consists of 60 open-ended interview questions which are categorized into 12 themes.

Use of the process. Selection Research, Incorporated, developer and distributor of the TPI, agrees that effective teaching involves two major dimensions; knowledge and effective presentation of subject matter, and skills which promote the development of positive teacher-student relationships. While allowing that both dimensions are important, the TPI is addressed primarily to the dimension of teacher relationship with others (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1977a, p. 1).

The TPI was developed to provide a valid means for using an interview that would identify teachers who would develop positive working relationships with students. Employing the same interview questions and standardizing the interview situation allowed for consistent conditions with all teachers. The TPI is currently used as a selection and development instrument for elementary and high school teachers. Attributes ascribed to it are low cost, ease of administration, consistency across situations, objectivity, and certain criterion validity. Selection Research, Incorporated urges that the interpretation of the TPI, whether for purposes of teacher selection or teacher development, be used in conjunction with other information about the individual. Following a review of the TPI process, Savage (1982) supports its use to select teachers who "establish rapport with students, activate students to

become involved in the learning process, dedicate themselves to helping students learn, and are models of goal oriented people" (p. 22). As well, he sees equal potential for improving teaching effectiveness when the instrument is used to develop the strengths of teachers.

Validation research. The methodology and results of the validation studies in regard to the TPI have implications for the current study. In these studies the major criteria used to validate the TPI have been student and/or administrator ratings of teachers which represents the same criteria selected for the present study. The studies reviewed are organized according to the criteria used for validation and are presented under the following headings: student and administrator ratings; administrator ratings; and student ratings. A brief summary of the results of the validation studies follows.

Student and administrator ratings. Of the six studies that used both criteria three were school district validation studies (Millard & Brooks, 1974; Selection Research, Incorporated, 1978b; Selection Research, Incorporated, 1978c) and three were completed as dissertations (Chalker, 1981; Shillig, 1975; Simmons, 1976). A brief review of these studies follows.

In what is considered a landmark study, Millard and Brooks (1974) evaluated the first edition of the TPI over a

three year period. On the basis of TPI scores, 166 teachers were classified into a high group (the highly recommended and recommended) and a low group (the conditionally recommended and not recommended). The high group was rated significantly different by administrators in 7 out of 10 comparisons and rated significantly different by students in 8 out of 12 comparisons. The differences were not significant in the other comparisons.

A study for the Houston School district (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1978b) included 110 teachers who volunteered to be interviewed with the TPI and have their students rate them on a 24 item rating scale. Administrators rated the teachers on a four-point scale as follows: 4 outstanding; 3 capable; 2 average; 1 needs improvement. Results showed that the TPI correlated significantly ($p < .05$) and positively with both student ratings (+.35) and administrator ratings (+.40). A very similar study conducted with 74 teachers from Minneapolis - St.Paul schools (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1978c) revealed a significant correlation ($p < .01$) between administrators' ratings and the TPI (+.49) and no significant correlation between student ratings and the TPI.

A dissertation completed by Simmons (1976) and involving a random sample (N=42) of vocational agriculture instructors showed that the TPI correlated significantly

with both student ratings (+.40) and administrator ratings (+.37). Simmons used the 40 item student rating form and a 24 item administrator rating form. Chalker (1981) also found positive and significant correlations between the TPI and student ratings and administrator quartile rankings with a sample of 40 teachers. He concluded that the TPI was a significant predictor of student oriented teachers. In contrast, Shillig (1975) reported no significant correlation between either of the criterion indices for a group of teachers hired by the TPI process and a group hired by conventional methods.

An examination of the themes of the TPI in relation to student and administrator ratings reveals that the themes of Rapport Drive, Input Drive, Activation and Innovation correlated most frequently with administrator ratings. Themes of Mission, Listening, Gestalt and Focus correlated most often with student ratings (Savage, 1982, p. 13).

There are also several studies in which the relationship between administrator ratings and student ratings was explored. Selection Research, Incorporated (1978c) reported a correlation of +.49 ($p < .01$) between the two raters with a sample of 74 teachers. Shillig (1975) also reported a positive and significant correlation between student and administrator ratings with a sample of 40 teachers. In contrast, the results of a study with 110

teachers revealed a correlation coefficient of .05 between student and administrator ratings (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1978b).

Administrator ratings. Validation studies in which the TPI has been evaluated using administrator ratings as the single criterion are two in number; one conducted with a Georgia school district (Coker, Lorentz, & Coker, 1976) and the other completed for a dissertation (Anderson, 1977).

Teachers, rated by administrators as effective (N=32) and less effective (N=32), volunteered to be interviewed with the TPI. Discriminant analysis revealed that the groups of teachers differed significantly on 7 of the 12 themes of the TPI (Coker, Lorentz, & Coker, 1976). Anderson (1977) found a significant correlation of .62 ($p < .05$) between administrator rankings of 30 teachers and the teachers' scores on the TPI.

Student ratings. The six studies conducted to validate the TPI using student ratings as the criterion index have been those of Muller (1974, 1976a, 1976b, 1977) and Selection Research, Incorporated (1977b, 1978a). With a small sample of secondary teachers (N=15) in a Chicago school, Muller (1974) reported a correlation of +.75 between the TPI and student ratings. Other reported correlation coefficients between the TPI and student ratings have been the following: +.36 ($p < .01$) with a sample of 81 elementary

and secondary teachers from New Orleans (Muller, 1976a); +.46 ($p < .01$) with 25 Houston school teachers (Muller, 1977); +.39 ($p < .05$) with 28 Reno teachers (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1977b). It was found that ratings of teachers with 20 or more student ratings tended to correlate more highly with the TPI than those with fewer number of student ratings (Muller, 1976a). A three year study in which over 500 student evaluations were collected revealed that students' rating of teachers increased significantly as teachers with high TPI scores were hired (Muller, 1976b). The results were further supported in a five year follow up study (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1978a).

Summary of validation research. A review of the research which has evaluated the TPI using criterion indices of administrator ratings, student ratings, or both, yields fairly consistent evidence that the TPI is a useful measure for identifying teachers who develop positive working relationships, as perceived by students and administrators. In all studies reviewed only Shillig (1975) reported no significant correlations between the TPI and administrator and student ratings and Selection Research, Incorporated (1978c) who reported no significant correlation between the TPI and student ratings.

The findings in regard to the correlation between student and administrator ratings is less clear.

Other Research. A review of seven studies indicates the TPI has been evaluated using other criteria including student self concept (Muller, 1976b; Selection Research, Incorporated, 1978a), teacher classroom behavior (Chalker, 1981; Jones, 1978), academic achievement (Aarestad, 1981), and teacher development (Brown, 1980; Dickerson, 1981). Results from these studies suggest the following: (a)as teacher talent (measured by the TPI) was increased, students' self concept (measured by the Self Concept as a Learner Scale) significantly increased with the increases being maintained at the end of a 5 year study, (b)the TPI is predictive of teacher classroom behavior deemed to be conducive to productive teacher-student relationships as measured by the Flanders Interaction Analysis and the McDaniel Observer Rating Scales, (c)there is no significant relationship between TPI scores and percent mean gain scores for mathematics achievement tests, (d)considerable teacher growth can occur in 4 to 12 months through application of the individualized approach recommended in the TPI process.

As well, Muller (1976a) has investigated the TPI and student rating correlations between such teacher variables as color, sex, and grade level.

Summary of Literature Review

The focus of the literature review pertained to three major areas: hospital diploma programs in nursing, teacher-student relationships, and the Teacher Perceiver Interview process.

In the first section, the characteristics of hospital diploma programs in nursing were described and compared to other approaches to nursing education. Evidence was presented to indicate the significance of these programs in the preparation of nurses in the province. Practices relating to the selection, development, and evaluation of nursing faculty were discussed including: the merits of an objective and consistent interview format as part of the faculty selection proedure; the need for faculty development programs that meet the expectations of both school and faculty member; the use of various methods for teacher evaluation.

In the second section of Chapter 2, research and literature were reviewed which contributed to a description of the nature of teacher-student relationships. The relevance of this relationship to effective teaching was pointed out. The responsibility of nursing faculty for the development of positive relationships with students was documented from the nursing literature. Research in relation to evaluation of teaching, particularly from the

student point of view, revealed the importance of teacher-student relationships to effective teaching.

The last section of the literature review consisted of a survey of the Teacher Perceiver Interview including a description of the development and use of the instrument. Data from studies were summarized in regard to validation of the instrument on the basis of student and administrator ratings. Results of these studies suggest the Teacher Perceiver Interview is a valid instrument in predicting student oriented teachers. As well, studies in which other criteria were used to evaluate the Teacher Perceiver Interview were briefly reviewed and the results summarized.

Hypotheses

The following eight hypotheses, stated in the directon expected, are formulated upon the literature previously presented in this chapter. Grouping of the hypotheses under the three headings and including a restatement of each question may serve to clarify for the reader the relationship between the hypotheses and the questions posed in Chapter 1, pertaining to the major purpose of the study.

Nursing Instructor Performance

Is nursing instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview related to ratings by the instructor's students and by the director of the school of nursing?

Hypothesis 1. There is a significant positive relationship between the nursing instructor's total score on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and the mean rating score of students on the Student Questionnaire.

Hypothesis 2. There is a significant positive relationship between the nursing instructor's total score on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and the total rating score of the nursing school director on the Director Questionnaire.

Relationship of Ratings

Is there a relationship between the ratings of directors and students for nursing instructors?

Hypothesis 3. There is a significant positive relationship between the total rating score received by the nursing instructor from the nursing school director on the Director Questionnaire and the student mean rating score on the Student Questionnaire.

TPI Themes and Items

Which particular themes and items of the Teacher Perceiver Interview show a relationship to student and director ratings?

Hypothesis 4. There is a significant positive relationship between the nursing instructor's theme scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and the mean rating score

of students on the Student Questionnaire.

Hypothesis 5. There is a significant positive relationship between the nursing instructor's theme scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and the total rating score of the nursing school director on the Director Questionnaire.

Hypothesis 6. There are particular questions on the Teacher Perceiver Interview significant in identifying nursing instructors who develop positive teacher-student relationships.

Effective and Less Effective Performance

Is effective and less effective nursing instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview rated differently by students and directors?

Hypothesis 7. Nursing instructors whose scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview are in the effective range, rather than the less effective range, receive significantly higher student mean rating scores.

Hypothesis 8. Nursing instructors whose scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview are in the effective range, rather than the less effective range, receive significantly higher director mean rating scores.

Questions

A minor purpose of this study is to investigate the relevance of particular nursing instructor characteristics to instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview. The following questions which relate to the secondary questions posed in Chapter 1, are presented. The three questions do not appear to have been investigated in the nursing literature. As a result, the findings in regard to these questions may impart new information. Logical assumptions, on the part of the investigator, are made as to the possible trend of the findings.

Question 1

Is there a significant difference between Teacher Perceiver Interview mean scores of nursing instructors in particular clinical specialties?

Possibly nursing instructors in the clinical specialty of Mental Health, who have particular training and interest in relationship skills, will show Interview scores significantly higher than instructors in other clinical areas.

Question 2

Is there a significant difference between Teacher Perceiver Interview mean scores of nursing instructors teaching in different year levels?

Nursing instructors teaching in first year may be more aware of and interested in the beginning student's need for a close and supportive relationship. As a result first year instructors may score significantly higher on the Interview than instructors teaching in other years.

Question 3

Is there a significant relationship between the nursing instructor's total score on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and her age, teaching experience, nursing experience, and educational preparation?

It is expected that a positive relationship will be demonstrated between each of the variables listed and the instructor's achievement on the Interview. Teaching experience, nursing experience, and education (each of which will probably correlate with age) should enhance the nursing instructor's effectiveness with students and, as a result, these variables should show a positive correlation to the instructor's Interview score.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The content of Chapter 3 consists of a description of the sample selected for the study, the instruments used, and the procedure involved in conducting the study. The chapter concludes with a section in which the limitations and delimitations of the study are indicated.

Sample

The sample for this study actually consisted of the total nursing instructor population of the three existing hospital-affiliated diploma nursing programs in Edmonton who met the following criteria: (a)taught in both clinical and classroom settings, and (b)had taught at least twenty students in the program. The 48 instructors were contacted personally by the investigator and each consented to participate in the study and, in fact, completed the study.

The nursing instructors may be described as (a)female, (b)registered nurses, (c)between the ages of 23 and 50 years of age, (d)having less than one year to 18 years of nursing experience, and (e) having less than one year to 19 years of teaching experience. Forty-five instructors had a Bachelor's degree and three instructors had, as the highest level of preparation, a diploma in nursing.

Nursing instructors teaching in diploma programs were chosen as subjects for this study for the following reasons:

1. The majority of nurse manpower continues to be prepared in diploma programs (Kerr, 1982).
2. Diploma programs are currently receiving funding for expansion and will continue to play an important role in preparing nurses for the next two decades (Kerr, 1982).
3. Most research in nursing education pertains to university programs with much less attention to diploma nursing education as a relevant focus of research.

Other participants in the study included 463 nursing students who represented 91 percent of the potential number of students who could complete questionnaires on the 48 instructors. The students were (a)458 females and 5 males, (b)enrolled in the school of nursing, and (c)completing the first, second, or third year of the program.

Also included in the study were the three school of nursing directors who completed questionnaires on each of their instructors involved in the study. All three directors had been in their position of director for over five years.

Instruments

Teacher Perceiver Interview (TPI). The Teacher Perceiver Interview, 1977 edition, is an instrument developed by Selection Research, Incorporated, for the

purpose of measuring job-related characteristics of teachers with emphasis on relations with others. The instrument is used to help select teachers and also as a tool to help teachers develop their teaching strengths. The instrument consists of 60 open-ended interview questions which are divided into 12 theme categories. For each question a predictive response (as designated in the scoring key and paraphrased by the subject) is marked 1 and a nonpredictive response is marked 0. Each answer is judged as either predictive or nonpredictive of the behaviour or belief involved in the theme. The positive responses making up the scoring key were empirically derived from the responses of teachers that were identified as having positive relationships with students (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1977a). The overall total score for the Interview can range from 0 to 60. A total score and twelve theme scores can be calculated for each subject. A description of the twelve themes, excerpted from the technical report, follows (Muller, 1978b, p. 5-6).

Mission: Mission is what takes some individuals and groups out of society's mainstream in order to assure the quality and purposiveness of that mainstream. Mission is a deep underlying belief that students can grow and attain self-actualization. A teacher with mission has a

goal to make a significant contribution to other people.

Empathy: Empathy is the apprehension and acceptance of the state of mind of another person. Practically, we say we put ourselves into the other person's place. Empathy is the phenomenon that provides the teacher feedback about the individual student's feelings and thoughts.

Rapport Drive: The rapport drive is evidenced by the teacher's ability to have an approving and mutually favorable relationship with each student. The teacher likes students and expects them to reciprocate. Rapport is seen by the teacher as a favorable and necessary condition of learning.

Individualized Perception: Individualized perception means that the teacher spontaneously thinks about the interests and needs of each student and makes every effort to personalize each student's program.

Listening: The listening theme is evident when a person spontaneously listens to others with responsiveness and acceptance. Listening is viewed as beneficial to the speaker.

Investment: The investment theme is indicated by the teacher's capacity to receive satisfaction

from the growth of students. This is in contrast to the person who must personally perform to achieve satisfaction.

Input Drive: Input drive is evidenced by the teacher who is continuously searching for ideas, materials and experiences to use in helping other people, especially students.

Activation: Activation indicates that the teacher is capable of stimulating students to think, to respond, to feel - to learn.

Innovation: The innovation theme is indicated when a teacher tries new ideas and techniques. A certain amount of determination is observed in this theme because the idea has to be implemented. At a higher level of innovation is creativity where the teacher has the capability of putting information and experience together into new configuration.

Gestalt: The Gestalt theme indicates the teacher has a drive toward completeness. The teacher sees in patterns - is uneasy until work is finished. When Gestalt is high, the teacher tends toward perfectionism. Even though form and structure are important, the individual student is considered first. The teacher works from individual to structure. Beware of inflexibility.

Objectivity: Objectivity is indicated when a teacher responds to the total situation. Gets facts and understands first as compared to making an impulsive reaction.

Focus: Focus is indicated when a person has models and goals. The person's life is moving in a planned direction. The teacher knows what the goals are and selects activities in terms of these goals.

Minor adaptations were made in The Teacher Perceiver Interview, 1977 edition, to reflect a nursing context. The adaptations related to wording, such as the substitution of nursing instructor for teacher, director for principal, and in one question the substitution of History of Nursing for English, and in another question, sterile technique for multiplication tables. The adapted version was piloted with six nursing educators.

Reliability. Reliability of The Teacher Perceiver Interview is discussed in terms of internal consistency, inter-rater reliability, and test-retest reliability.

Internal consistency of the Teacher Perceiver Interview, or the extent to which parts of the instrument measure the same function, has been based on the Kuder-Richardson formula 21 which yielded coefficients of .77 or .76 on four samples of teachers and teacher applicants (Selection Research, Inc., 1977a). In the

opinion of Savage (1982) the item intercorrelations "are not overly high which suggests that the interview is tapping a number of different factors" (p. 7).

Inter-rater reliability, or the extent of agreement between scorers, has been established as part of the training process required for use of the Teacher Perceiver Interview. Inter-rater reliability between trainers and trainees must reach 85 percent agreement.

In regard to test-retest reliability of the instrument, Savage (1982) reports one study with 30 teachers where a test-retest correlation coefficient of .95 was established. However, clear evidence of test-retest reliability is lacking according to the manual (Selection Research, Inc., 1977a, p. 10).

Validity. The most common criterion used to validate the Teacher Perceiver Interview has been student and administrator (generally principal) ratings. These criteria have provided predictive validity. The validation studies reviewed in Chapter 2 also relate to the predictive validity of the instrument. In his review of The Teacher Perceiver Interview, Savage (1982) reported an average correlation of +.37 with student ratings and +.41 with administrator ratings. While these correlation coefficients may appear moderate in magnitude, Anastasi (1976) states "a test may appreciably improve predictive efficiency if it shows any

significant correlation with the criterion, however low" (p. 166). In addition, the majority of validation studies of the Teacher Perceiver Interview were completed with in-place teachers which represents a preselected sample. "The effect of such preselection will therefore be to lower the validity coefficient" (Anastasi, 1976, p. 164).

SRI Student Questionnaire. Selection Research, Incorporated, developed the Teacher Perceiver Academy Student Questionnaire (7-A) generating items of teacher behavior to correspond with the twelve themes of the TPI. The questionnaire (Appendix A) is composed of 40 items with a possible score between 40 and 200. Used with over 2000 students this instrument has been fairly reliable over time with a test-retest reliability coefficient of .91 (Muller, 1974). Examples of items from the questionnaire follow:

3. My teacher likes me.
9. My teacher encourages me to think of new ways to do things.

In the particular schools of nursing selected for this study, nursing students refer to their teachers as nursing instructors. As a result, adaptations were made in the questionnaire which replaced the word teacher with nursing instructor. As well, feminine gender was used for third person pronouns since all instructors were female. The questionnaire, thus adapted and appearing as it was used in

the study, is included in Appendix B.

SRI Questionnaire for Teacher Advocates. Selection Research, Incorporated, developed the Questionnaire for Teacher Advocates (Appendix C) which consists of 24 items adapted from the first 24 items of the Student Questionnaire. Scores on the five-point scale can range from 24 to 120. The following are examples of items from the questionnaire:

3. This teacher likes students.
9. This teacher encourages students to think of new ways to do things.

The same adaptations made in the questionnaire for students were made in the questionnaire for the directors of the schools of nursing. The adapted questionnaire used in the study, titled 'Director Questionnaire' is included in Appendix D.

Procedure

Information to participants. The participating nursing instructors, their students, and each nursing school director were given the following information by the investigator:

1. The research is being conducted as part of the requirements for a doctoral degree in Educational Psychology at the University of Alberta.
2. The purpose of the research is to investigate teaching

effectiveness from the perspective of instructors, students, and directors.

3. All information from each instructor, student, and director will remain confidential.
4. Upon completion, the study results will be presented to participants from each school of nursing with mutual arrangement of presentation date and time.

Nursing instructor, school of nursing director, and student consent forms used in the study are included in Appendix I.

Instructor data. Before beginning the interview, the interviewer gathered the following information from each nursing instructor. The information, sought orally and informally, also helped to establish the necessary rapport before commencing the interview.

1. Clinical specialty: Medicine; Surgery; Obstetrics; Pediatrics; Psychiatry.
2. Year level of program: First; Second; Third.
3. Nursing experience: Years (with part-time experience condensed).
4. Teaching experience: Years (with part-time experience condensed).
5. Age:

Interview procedure. Each of the 48 nursing instructors was interviewed with The Teacher Perceiver Interview by the investigator. Each interview followed standardized procedure, was conducted in a friendly and nonjudgmental manner, and took place in a private and comfortable setting at the school of nursing. The interview, which took approximately one hour, was tape recorded for the purpose of later scoring and to establish inter-rater reliability. Once rapport was established the interviewer made the following statement to the nursing instructor:

> I hope to discover if this interview process is a useful way to identify nursing instructor's teaching strengths. As you respond to the questions do so from your perspective as a teacher. The interview has some interesting and straight forward questions that you should find thought provoking and helpful.
>
> I will read the questions exactly as they are written. I will not interpret them to you. It is your interpretation that is important, so just think of yourself in the context of the question and answer each question as best you can. I will not interrupt your responses with my observations or comments. I will be concentrating on simply listening to you. I will repeat a question whenever

you want me to, and you may go back and add to previous questions anytime you want to.

Unless you have a question, I'll turn on the recorder and we will get underway. Okay?

Questionnaire procedure. Students completed a questionnaire on one to three nursing instructors with whom they had a clinical/classroom experience of two to three months during the previous 10 months. Year level coordinators from each school of nursing assisted the investigator in the preliminary planning for the collection of student data. Which students would complete questionnaires on which instructor was predetermined on the basis of the student's rotation for that particular 10 month period. The investigator administered the questionnaire to students who were grouped according to year level. The questionnaire, which took approximately 20 minutes to complete, contained the instructor's name as the only identification.

Nursing school directors completed the Director Questionnaire for each of their instructors interviewed with the Teacher Perceiver Interview. In the case of two of the directors, year level coordinators assisted in the completion of the questionnaire, which took approximately ten minutes. Again, the only identification on the questionnaire was the instructor's name.

Both the Student and Director Questionnaires were optically scored. Prior to scoring, an identifying code was entered for each instructor.

Inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability establishes the degree of consistency in scoring that occurs between two or more raters. Twenty-five percent of the nursing instructor interview tapes were scored by Selection Research, Incorporated, Perceiver Academies staff. The percent of agreement ranged from 81 to 97 percent on the individual tapes with an overall percent agreement of 89.37 for the twelve tapes.

Certification of interviewer. It is stipulated by Selection Research, Incorporated, that the Teacher Perceiver Interview must be administered and interpreted by individuals certified by Perceiver Academies. The instrument and results derived from the interview are considered valid only when processed by a Certified Teacher Perceiver Specialist.

The specialized and fairly extensive training involves demonstrations and practice components. A major focus of training is concentrated on the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the interview. Thirty-two interviews are required to be scored and analyzed with an 85 percent agreement occurring between the trainee and Selection Research, Incorporated trainers. Satisfactory completion of

the training results in certification.

The investigator of the present research is a Certified Teacher Perceiver Specialist, certificate number 2056 dated March 10, 1982.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The limitations of the study, outlined in the following points, are in regard to the Teacher Perceiver Interview and to the study sample.

1. The test-retest reliability of the Teacher Perceiver Interview is unclear, hence the stability of performance on the Interview is open to some question.
2. Student response on the questionnaires reflects student perception of the instructor at the time of completing the questionnaire. The same may be said in regard to director questionnaires.
3. The participants in the study are from hospital-based diploma programs in nursing; generalizing the findings to other nursing programs must be done with caution.
4. The theory pertaining to the area of teacher-student relationships and their relevance to effective teaching is probably culturally based. The Teacher Perceiver Interview, which was designed to assess a teacher's ability to relate to others, may be said to reflect this cultural bias. As a result, application of the Teacher Perceiver Interview process outside of North America may

be inappropriate.

The delimitaions, outlined in the following points, refer to the boundaries of the study that have been arbitrarily selected by the investigator.

1. The process dimension of teaching which includes teacher relationships with students has been selected for study. No attention has been given to the content dimension which includes teacher mastery of subject matter.
2. Criterion measures used to validate the Teacher Perceiver Interview have been limited to student and nursing school director ratings.
3. The sample of nursing instructors is restricted to those instructors a) teaching in hospital-based diploma nursing programs, and b) involved in both classroom and clinical teaching.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The content of Chapter 4, which consists of the results of the study, is divided into three sections. The first section, concerned with the major results of the study, comprises a restatement and testing of the eight hypotheses which deal with instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview in relation to student and director ratings. Statistical testing of the first six hypotheses involved the computation of Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation. Testing of the last two hypotheses included the use of *t*-test procedures.

Section two of the chapter is concerned with subordinate results and contains a restatement of the three questions pertaining to particular nursing instructor characteristics and their relevance to instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview. Examination of questions one and two involved use of the analysis of variance technique. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed for the analysis of question three.

The third section of Chapter 4 deals with descriptive results and includes a comparison of Teacher Perceiver Interview means, descriptive analysis of the student and

director questionnaires, and a summary of instructor response to the interview.

Major Results

Hypothesis 1.

There is a significant positive relationship between the nursing instructor's total score on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and the mean rating score of students on the Student Questionnaire.

Results of the statistical testing of Hypothesis 1 are presented in Table 3. The relationship between nursing instructor Teacher Perceiver Interview scores and student mean rating scores of the instructors is shown by a positive Pearson correlation coefficent of .24, significant beyond the .05 level. Hypothesis 1 is therefore supported.

Table 3

Coefficients of Correlation Between Teacher Perceiver Interview Scores And Ratings Of Nursing Instructors (N=48)

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation to Student Rating	Correlation to Director Rating
TPI	25.33	5.66	.24*	.41**
Student Rating	155.19	12.56		.45**
Director Rating	96.81	13.22		-

* Significant beyond p <.05
** Significant beyond p <.01

Hypothesis 2.

There is a significant positive relationship between the nursing instructors' total score on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and the total rating score of the nursing school director on the Director Questionnaire.

Results of the statistical testing of Hypothesis 2 are presented in Table 3. The relationship between nursing instructor Teacher Perceiver Interview scores and nursing school director ratings of the instructors is shown by a positive Pearson correlation coefficient of .41, significant beyond the .01 level. Hypothesis 2 is supported.

Hypothesis 3.

There is a significant positive relationship between the total rating score received by the nursing instructor from the nursing school director on the Director Questionnaire and the student mean rating score on the Student Questionnaire.

Results of the statistical testing of Hypothesis 3 are presented in Table 3. The positive relationship between director and student ratings of nursing instructors is indicated by a Pearson correlation coefficient of .45, significant beyond the .01 level. Thus Hypothesis 3 is accepted.

Hypothesis 4.

There is a significant positive relationship between the nursing instructors' theme scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and the mean rating score of students on the Student Questionnaire.

In Table 4, the data used to test Hypothesis 4 are presented. The mean score of nursing instructors for each of the twelve themes was correlated with the mean rating score of their students. Nursing instructor scores on three themes correlate significantly and positively with student mean ratings. The themes of Mission and Rapport Drive reached a level of significance beyond .01, while the theme, Input Drive, reached the .05 level of significance. Thus

Hypothesis 4 is supported for the three themes mentioned and not supported for the other nine themes. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 is largely not supported.

Table 4

Coefficients of Correlation Between Teacher Perceiver Interview Theme Scores And Ratings Of Nursing Instructors (N=48)

Theme	Mean	SD	Correlation to Student Rating	Correlation to Director Rating	Correlation to TPI Total
Mission	1.14	1.01	.32 **	.14	.55 ***
Empathy	1.52	1.30	.04	.12	.39 **
Rapport Drive	1.85	.89	.33 **	.39 **	.49 ***
Individualized Perception	1.83	.95	.19	.17	.32 **
Listening	2.45	1.11	-.09	.26 *	.48 ***
Investment	2.18	.98	-.05	.08	.03
Input Drive	2.91	1.21	.28 *	.32 **	.57 ***
Activation	2.37	1.10	.07	.19	.50 ***
Innovation	2.47	1.16	-.08	.10	.39 **
Gestalt	2.18	1.03	-.01	.18	.45 ***
Objectivity	2.08	1.21	.20	.07	.49 ***
Focus	2.41	1.12	.08	.08	.43 ***

* Significant beyond $p < .05$
** Significant beyond $p < .01$
*** Significant beyond $p < .001$

Hypothesis 5.

There is a significant positive relationship between the nursing instructors' theme scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and the total rating score of the nursing school director on the Director Questionnaire.

The mean score of the nursing instructors on each of the twelve themes was correlated with the total rating score given each instructor by the director. Nursing instructor scores on three themes correlate positively and significantly with director ratings. As shown in Table 4, the themes of Rapport Drive and Input Drive reached the .01 level of significance and the Listening theme correlated significantly at the .05 level. Hypothesis 5 is supported for the three themes mentioned and not supported for the other nine themes. Therefore Hypothesis 5 is largely not supported.

Hypothesis 6.

There are individual questions on the Teacher Perceiver Interview significant in identifying nursing instructors who develop positive teacher-student relationships.

In the analysis of each of the sixty questions comprising the Teacher Perceiver Interview three separate correlations were conducted which included (a)an item to total correlation, (b)an item to student rating correlation, and (c)an item to director rating correlation.

To present the data in a form more readily analyzed by the reader, Simmons' (1976) method was adopted whereby each correlation coefficient was assigned a numerical score according to the following format:

-1.0	-	.0	=	1
.0	-	+.10	=	2
+.10	-	+.20	=	3
+.20	-	+.30	=	4
+.30 and above			=	5

Table 5 presents the numerical scores assigned to the three sets of correlation coefficients for the sixty questions of the Teacher Perceiver Interview. In Appendix E the actual correlation coefficients are presented. An example of how the total numerical score was obtained can be seen by referring to Appendix E, question 15. The correlation coefficient for item to total was .12 giving a numerical score of 3. The correlation coefficient for item to student rating was .17 also giving a numerical score of 3. The item to director correlation coefficient was .25 giving a numerical score of 4. Adding the scores gives a total numerical score of 10 for question 15, as can be noted in Table 5.

The sum of the total score column was 489 with an average score of 8.15 for the sixty questions. Following

Simmons' procedure, any question having a total score above the average score would receive more emphasis. As a result, twenty-nine questions out of the sixty question interview were selected. On this basis, Hypothesis 6 is accepted for the twenty-nine questions which received a total score of nine or more points.

In Table 6 the particular questions and the themes they represent are shown. These twenty-nine questions may be considered discriminating in identifying nursing instructors who develop positive student-teacher relationships. It can be noted as well that the greater number of questions are from the following seven themes: Mission, Rapport Drive, Individualized Perception, Input Drive, Activation, Objectivity, and Focus.

To test the predictive quality of the twenty-nine questions, the nursing instructor's score on those questions was correlated with the mean rating score of students and with the total rating score of her director. The results, in Table 7, show a Pearson correlation coefficient of .43, significant beyond the .001 level, between the revised Teacher Perceiver Interview score and student rating. A Pearson correlation coefficient of .46, significant beyond the .001 level exists between the revised score and director rating. These correlation coefficients are both higher than those for the sixty question Teacher Perceiver Interview.

Hypothesis 6 is therefore accepted.

Table 5

Numerical Scores Assigned To The Correlation Coefficients For Individual Questions On The Teacher Perceiver Interview

Question	Mean	Standard Deviation	Item to Total	Item to Student Rating	Item to Director Rating	Total Score
1	.22	.42	4	5	3	12 *
2	.20	.41	4	1	3	8
3	.12	.33	5	4	2	11 *
4	.45	.50	2	1	1	4
5	.87	.33	4	1	3	8
6	.20	.41	1	2	1	4
7	.56	.50	4	4	3	11 *
8	.16	.37	4	2	3	9 *
9	.68	.46	5	1	1	7
10	.64	.48	3	2	2	7
11	.41	.44	5	2	2	9 *
12	.62	.48	1	1	1	3
13	.12	.33	2	1	1	4
14	.29	.45	3	1	3	7
15	.29	.45	3	3	4	10 *
16	.45	.50	4	2	3	9 *
17	.66	.47	4	3	3	10 *
18	.68	.46	3	3	2	8

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Mean	Standard Deviation	Item to Total	Item to Student Rating	Item to Director Rating	Total Score
19	.93	.24	1	1	1	3
20	.77	.42	3	1	3	7
21	.27	.44	4	4	4	12 *
22	.35	.48	5	1	3	9 *
23	.25	.43	3	1	1	5
24	.62	.48	4	1	3	8
25	.43	.50	5	3	1	9 *
26	.41	.49	3	1	1	5
27	.37	.48	5	5	4	14 *
28	.56	.50	4	3	2	9 *
29	.41	.49	3	1	3	7
30	.52	.50	3	1	2	6
31	.56	.50	5	3	4	12 *
32	.56	.50	1	1	1	3
33	.45	.50	2	1	1	4
34	.58	.49	2	1	1	4
35	.14	.35	4	4	3	11 *
36	.31	.46	4	3	2	9 *
37	.14	.35	4	4	2	10 *
38	.41	.49	5	3	3	11 *

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Mean	Standard Deviation	Item to Total	Item to Student Rating	Item to Director Rating	Total Score
39	.93	.24	5	1	4	10 *
40	.29	.45	1	3	2	6
41	.10	.30	4	1	1	6
42	.62	.48	1	1	1	3
43	.25	.43	4	1	3	8
44	.47	.50	5	4	5	14 *
45	.52	.50	2	1	1	4
46	.25	.43	4	1	2	7
47	.56	.50	4	2	3	9 *
48	.54	.50	4	2	3	9 *
49	.20	.41	5	3	5	13 *
50	.18	.39	2	2	3	7
51	.12	.33	2	1	3	6
52	.06	.24	3	3	4	10 *
53	.39	.49	5	1	4	10 *
54	.14	.35	3	1	3	7
55	.60	.49	5	5	5	15 *
56	.39	.49	5	3	3	11 *
57	.54	.50	4	1	3	8
58	.27	.44	3	4	3	10 *

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Mean	Standard Deviation	Item to Total	Item to Student Rating	Item to Director Rating	Total Score
59	.70	.45	3	3	1	7
60	.31	.46	4	3	3	10 *

* Total Score of 9 or more.

Table 6

Teacher Perceiver Interview Questions Considered Predictive In Identifying Nursing Instructors

Theme	Number	Questions Per Theme
Mission	1,25,37,49	4
Empathy	38	1
Rapport Drive	3,15,27,39	4
Individualized Perception	16,28,52	3
Listening	17,53	2
Investment		
Input Drive	7,31,55	3
Activation	3,44,56	3
Innovation	21	1
Gestalt	22,58	2
Objectivity	11,35,47	3
Focus	36,48,60	3
	Total	29

Table 7

Coefficients Of Correlation Between Revised Teacher Perceiver Interview Scores And Ratings Of Nursing Instructors (N=48)

Correlation To	
Student Rating	Director Rating
.43 *	.46 *

* Significant beyond $p < .001$

Hypothesis 7.

Nursing instructors whose scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview are in the effective range, rather than the less effective range, receive significantly higher student mean rating scores.

Nursing instructors whose scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview were twenty-four or less were categorized in the less effective range while those instructors with scores twenty-five and above were categorized in the effective range. The criteria for these ranges have been established by Selection Research, Incorporated (1977a, p. 33-34).

Results of the *t*-test, presented in Table 8, show that a difference exists, significant beyond the .01 level,

between the mean scores of student ratings for the two categories of nursing instructors. Students gave a significantly higher rating to instructors whose scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview were in the effective range. Hypothesis 7 is therefore accepted.

Table 8

t-Test On Student Rating Means For Nursing Instructors With Teacher Perceiver Scores In Two Ranges

Instructor TPI Score	N	Student Mean	Standard Deviation	Pooled Variance Estimate t Value	df	2-tail Prob.
≤ 24	18	149.04	12.46			
				-2.82	46	.007 *
≥ 25	30	158.89	11.26			

* Significant beyond $p < .01$

Hypothesis 8.

Nursing instructors whose scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview are in the effective range, rather than the less effective range, receive significantly higher director mean rating scores.

The same categorization used for Hypothesis 7 was used for Hypothesis 8. Results of the t-test, reported in Table 9, indicate a significant difference, beyond the .01 level,

between the mean scores of director ratings for the two categories of nursing instructor performance. Directors rated significantly higher the instructors whose scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview were in the effective range. For this reason, Hypothesis 8 is accepted.

Table 9

t-Test On Director Rating Means For Nursing Instructors With Teacher Perceiver Scores In Two Ranges

Instructor TPI Score	N	Director Mean	Standard Deviation	Separate Variance Estimate t Value	df	2-tail Prob.
≤ 24	18	89.22	14.79			
				-3.09	26.24	.005 *
≥ 25	30	101.36	9.89			

* Significant beyond $p < .01$

Summary of Results.

1. Nursing instructor scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview show a significant and positive correlation with both student ratings and director ratings (Hypotheses 1 and 2).
2. Director ratings and student ratings show significant and positive correlation (Hypothesis 3).
3. Nursing instructor scores on particular Teacher

Perceiver Interview themes show a significant and positive correlation with both student ratings and director ratings (Hypotheses 4 and 5).

4. Twenty-nine items of the Teacher Perceiver Interview are significant predictors of nursing instructors who develop positive teacher-student relationships (Hypothesis 6).
5. Nursing instructors whose scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview are in the effective, rather than less effective, range are rated significantly higher by both students and directors (Hypotheses 7 and 8).

Subordinate Results

Question 1.

Is there a significant difference between Teacher Perceiver Interview mean scores of nursing instructors in particular clinical specialties?

Nursing instructors taught predominately in one of the following clinical specialties: Medicine, Mental Health, Obstetrics, Pediatrics, or Surgery. As can be seen in Table 10, the greatest number of instructors taught in the specialty of Medicine.

In Table 11, the results of the analysis of variance reveal that no difference was found, at the established level of significance, between the mean scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview of nursing instructors in the

five clinical specialties.

Table 10

Teacher Perceiver Interview Characteristics Of Nursing Instructors In Different Clinical Specialty Groups

Clinical Speciality	N	Teacher Perceiver Interview Mean	Standard Deviation	Low Score	High Score
Medicine	16	24.75	6.92	12	35
Mental Health	7	27.00	8.81	17	43
Obstetrics	6	26.00	2.52	23	29
Pediatrics	7	25.14	3.71	20	31
Surgery	12	24.91	4.01	18	30

Table 11

Analysis Of Variance Between Nursing Instructors In Different Clinical Specialty Groups (N-48)

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	29.89	4	7.47	.21	.92
Within Groups	1476.77	43	34.34		
Total	1506.66	47			

Question 2.

Is there a significant difference between Teacher Perceiver Interview mean scores of nursing instructors teaching in different year levels?

Nursing instructors taught predominately in either first, second, or third year of the nursing programs. As presented in Table 12 the highest mean score on the Teacher Perceiver Interview was attained by first year nursing instructors, while the lowest mean score was achieved by third year instructors.

In the analysis of the data, presented in Table 13, the Scheffe procedure was used to compare individual groups in order to locate the differences which contributed to the analysis of variance results. The .10 level of significance was selected to counteract somewhat the rigorous nature of the Scheffe test (Ferguson, 1976, p.297). The results of the Scheffe test indicate a difference exists, significant at the .10 level, between the Teacher Perceiver Interview mean scores for first and third year nursing instructors.

Table 12

Teacher Perceiver Interview Mean Scores And Standard Deviations For Nursing Instructors In Different Year Levels

Year Level	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
First	13	27.84	4.68
Second	23	25.43	6.19
Third	12	22.41	4.42

Table 13

Analysis Of Variance Between Teacher Perceiver Interview Mean Scores For Nursing Instructors In Different Year Levels

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	184.39	2	92.19	3.13	.05 *
Within Groups	1322.25	45	29.38		
Total	1506.65	47			

* Significant beyond $p < .10$ (Scheffe Procedure).

Question 3.

Is there a significant relationship between the nursing instructor's total score on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and her age, teaching experience, and nursing experience?

The age range of the nursing instructors was twenty-six to fifty years with a mean age of thirty-four years. The relationship between nursing instructor scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and age is shown in Table 14 by a negative Pearson correlation coefficient of -.27, significant at the .05 level.

Nursing instructor years of teaching experience ranged from less than a year to nineteen years with a mean of 4.2 years. The relationship between nursing instructor scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and years of teaching experience is shown in Table 14 by a negative Pearson correlation coefficient of -.26, significant at the .05 level.

Nursing instructor years of nursing experience ranged from one to eighteen years with a mean of six years. The relationship between nursing instructor scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and years of nursing experience is shown in Table 14 by a negative Pearson correlation coefficient of -.18, which did not reach the required level of signficance.

Table 14

Coefficients Of Correlation Between Teacher Perceiver Interview Scores And Nursing Instructor Characteristics (N = 48)

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation To Age	Correlation To Teaching Experience	Correlation To Nursing Experience
TPI	25.33	5.66	-.27*	-.26*	-.18
Age	34.06	6.58	-	.54	.51
Teaching Experience	4.22	4.23		-	-.13
Nursing Experience	6.02	4.02			

* Significant beyond $p < .05$

In order to further explore the relationship of instructor age, teaching experience, and nursing experience with Teacher Perceiver Interview performance, a partial correlation was applied to the data, controlling for the influence of age. Results of this analysis revealed that instructor age is the significant factor that accounts for the relationship with instructor performance.

Initially included in Question 3 was investigation of the relationship between nursing instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and instructor level of

educational preparation. Forty-five of the instructors had a Bachelor's degree and three had as the highest level of preparation, a Diploma in Nursing. With so little difference in preparation levels further investigation was not warranted.

Summary of Results.

1. Nursing instructors in particular clinical specialties do not perform significantly different on the Teacher Perceiver Interview (Question 1).
2. Nursing instructors teaching in first year perform significantly higher on the Teacher Perceiver Interview than instructors teaching in third year (Question 2).
3. Nursing instructor age is the factor that shows a significant negative relationship to instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview (Question 3).

Descriptive Results

Comparison of Teacher Perceiver Interview Means.

Theme means and standard deviations were compared for the study group and a normative sample of female secondary teachers. The results of this comparison are reported in Table 15.

The two groups differ most widely on the means for the following themes: Mission, Input Drive, and Innovation. The Teacher Perceiver Interview total means of 25.99 for female

secondary teachers and 25.33 for nursing instructors are very similar. The difference in the standard deviations of the two groups indicates less variance in the nursing instructor group than in the normative group.

Table 15

Comparison Of Theme Scores For Female Normative Sample And Study Group

	Female Secondary Teachers N=78		Nursing Instructors N=48	
Theme	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Mission	2.27	1.08	1.14	1.01
Empathy	1.47	1.20	1.52	1.30
Rapport Drive	1.63	1.26	1.85	0.89
Ind. Perception	1.88	1.17	1.83	0.95
Listening	2.17	1.37	2.45	1.11
Investment	2.51	1.38	2.18	0.98
Input Drive	2.22	0.99	2.91	1.21
Activation	2.37	1.26	2.37	1.10
Innovation	2.96	1.23	2.47	1.16
Gestalt	1.88	1.04	2.10	1.03
Objectivity	1.96	1.18	2.08	1.21
Focus	2.65	1.29	2.41	1.12
Total	25.99	7.77	25.33	5.66

Note. The data on female secondary teachers are from Simmons, 1976.

Student Questionnaire Analysis.

In each of the forty questions comprising the Student Questionnaire the mean and standard deviation were calculated as well as the correlation coefficient of each question to the total. In Appendix F the table of correlation coefficients is presented. It can be noted in the Appendix that questions twelve and forty, with correlation coefficients of .21 and .26 respectively, correlate least well with the questionnaire total. The questions themselves may be referred to in Appendix B.

In Table 16 a mean score of 154.83 and a standard deviation of 26.25 is shown for the 1162 student questionnaires. While a range from forty to two hundred was possible on each rating, the actual mean score range for the forty-eight instructors was from 127.59 to 177.56.

Table 16

Student Questionnaire Mean Scores

N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Low Mean	High Mean
1162	154.83	25.25	127.59	177.56

Director Questionnaire Analysis.

For each of the twenty-four questions comprising the Director Questionnaire the mean and standard deviation were calculated as well as the correlation coefficient of each question to the total. In Appendix G the table of correlation coefficients is presented. It can be noted that questions seven and twelve, with correlation coefficients of .25 each, correlate the lowest with the questionnaire total. The questions themselves may be referred to in Appendix D.

In Table 17 a mean score of 96.75 and a standard deviation of 13.30 is shown for the forty-eight ratings completed by nursing school directors. While a score on each rating could range from twenty-four to one hundred and twenty the actual range was from 55 to 115.

Table 17

Director Questionnaire Scores

N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Low Mean	High Mean
43	96.75	13.30	55	115

Instructor Response to Interview.

At the conclusion of each interview the interviewer asked the following question, considered an optional question in the instructions for administering the Teacher Perciever Interview: "Tell me, how did you feel about this interview; how did you feel about answering all of these questions?" The statement of each nursing instructor, recorded verbatim, may be referred to in Appendix H.

A review of the responses revealed the following:

1. There were no negative statements about the content or process of the interview.
2. The interview was described as comfortable, non-threatening, relaxed, pleasant, enjoyable, worthwhile, helpful, interesting, useful, and a learning

experience.

3. The questions were described as thought provoking; important to teaching; helpful in exploring teaching beliefs, practices, and new ideas; practical, pertinent, and applicable; beneficial in evaluation of own strengths and weaknesses as a teacher; useful in reinforcing or clarifying own ideas about teaching; helpful in providing an opportunity to share thoughts about own teaching.
4. One nursing instructor commented that she found the questions at the beginnning hard and another stated she found the restriction on clarifying an interview question somewhat disconcerting.
5. Four nursing instructors stated they were unsure whether to interpret some of the interview questions using the context of large group classroom teaching or small group clinical teaching.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The content of Chapter 5 is focused on a presentation and discussion of the conclusions of the research, practical and theoretical implications of the study, and as well, suggestions for further research in the area.

Conclusions

From the analysis of the data, the following conclusions appear warranted.

1. Significant positive relationships were found between nursing instructor scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and student and director ratings. It is concluded that the Teacher Perceiver Interview is a useful instrument to identify nursing instructors who develop positive teacher-student relationships. The low to moderate correlation coefficients are not surprising in that the subjects consisted of employed nursing instructors who had already passed a screening process before being hired.

   The correlation coefficient of +.24 between nursing instructor scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and student ratings is somewhat lower than the average correlation of +.37 reported by Savage (1982) in his

summary of ten studies. However, the correlation coefficient of +.41 between nursing instructor scores on the interview and director ratings is the same as the average correlation of administrator ratings for the ten studies reviewed by Savage.

2. A significant positive relationship was found between student and director ratings of nursing instructor performance. This finding is supportive of other research (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1978c; Shillig, 1975).
3. Two themes of the Teacher Perceiver Interview, Rapport Drive and Input Drive, correlated positively and significantly with both student and director ratings of nursing instructors. As well, the Mission theme correlated significantly with student ratings and the Listening theme significantly correlated with director ratings. These themes may be considered stronger themes in identifying nursing instructors who are more orientated to students.
4. Twenty-nine of the sixty Teacher Perceiver Interview questions were more discriminating in identifying nursing instructors who develop positive student-teacher relationships. These twenty-nine questions and the themes they represent may be considered more predictive in identifying nursing instructors who develop positive

teacher-student relationships.

5. Nursing instructors whose performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview fell in the effective and less effective ranges were rated significantly different by both students and directors. Students and directors each gave a significantly higher rating to those nursing instructors whose performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview was in the effective range. Further evidence for the validity of the Teacher Perceiver Interview is provided by this finding.
6. Nursing instructors in different clinical specialties showed no significant differences in performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview. The assumption was not supported that nursing instructors in the specialty of Mental Health, which has a focus on the development of therapeutic relationships, would perform better on the Teacher Perceiver Interview.
7. There was a significant difference in performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview between first and third year level nursing instructors. Instructors teaching in first year scored significantly higher on the interview than instructors teaching in third year. With this finding there is support for the premise that instructors who teach first year nursing students may be particularly attuned to beginning students' need for a

more involved and supportive relationship with their instructor.

8. A significant negative relationship was found between nursing instructor performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and instructor age and instructor teaching experience. However, it is concluded on the basis of further analysis that this relationship is accounted for by age. It can be said, then, that as the age of nursing instructors increases there tends to be an association with lower scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview. One can speculate that this result could be due to younger instructors identifying with the needs of students whose ages are closer to their own. As well, it may be that as older instructors become more comfortable with clinical and classroom teaching, routine sets in and recognition of the individuality of each student in each situation becomes less distinct.
9. Comparing performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview, nursing instructors, while more homogeneous, appear quite similar to a normative sample of American female secondary teachers.
10. On the Student Questionnaire, completed by the nursing students, questions 12 and 40, which correlated least well with the questionnaire total were the same questions Simmons (1976) found to correlate least well

with the questionnaire total for vocational agriculture teachers. On the Director Questionnaire, question 12 correlated least well with the questionnaire total in both Simmons' study and the present study. These particular questions may be considered less valid for nursing students and nursing school directors.

11. Nursing instructors' descriptions of their reactions to the Teacher Perceiver Interview, content and process, suggest a comfortable and productive experience. Eight percent of instructors indicated uncertainty in whether to refer to classroom or clinical contexts when answering some of the interview questions. The positive response on the part of the nursing instructors to the interview may confirm the importance of establishing and maintaining rapport with the interviewee, a point emphasized by the developers of the instrument (Selection Research, Incorporated, 1977a, p.28).

Practical Implications

There are several implications arising from the conclusions of this research that are relevant to diploma nursing education.

Firstly, the Teacher Perceiver Interview, as a valid instrument for predicting nursing instructors who develop positive teacher-student relationships, could be used as part of the selection process for hiring nursing instructors

for diploma nursing programs. The structured nature of the Teacher Perceiver Interview offers a more objective basis for instructor selection than the subjectivity of the conventional interview used by most schools of nursing. It is recommended that the twenty-nine questions which appear most predictive be given some scrutiny when considering the instructor's suitability for a teaching position. The themes these questions represent - Mission, Rapport Drive, Individualized Perception, Input Drive, Activation, Objectivity, and Focus may be considered the more powerful themes. It is also recommended that nursing instructors whose performance on the Teacher Perceiver Interview is in the effective range, be considered for teaching positions, provided other selection criteria are met. Important to keep in mind is that the Teacher Perceiver Interview is recommended as one of a number of criterion measures to be used in the hiring of a nursing instructor.

Secondly, the Teacher Perceiver Interview may be employed as a tool to assist nursing instructors to develop their teaching strengths. The favorable response to the interview on the part of nursing instructors suggests they would welcome an opportunity to analyze their specific teaching abilities. Older instructors, those with more teaching experience, and those teaching in third year level may particularly benefit from affirmation of strengths and

the formulation of strategies for improvement of teaching.

Thirdly, of interest to those schools of nursing using student evaluation of instructors, the significant relationship between student and director ratings is a finding that supports the position that students are capable of evaluating instructor teaching behaviour.

Theoretical Implications

Perhaps the most important theoretical implication arising from this study pertains to that part of teaching known as the process dimension of teaching. The relationship that develops between teacher and student is a major part of this process dimension. Theorists who make the assumption that teaching is an interactive process urge educators to reach students before they teach them (Avila, Combs, & Purkey, 1977; Gorman, 1969; Rogers, 1969). Reducing the social distance between teacher and student while maintaining mutual respect sets a climate for learning, according to these writers. Great teachers, suggests Gorman (1969) have always been able to cut through communication barriers and reach their students and at the same time be personally flexible enough to let students reach them. The results of the present study lend support to the literature that emphasizes the teacher-student relationship as an important component of teaching.

In addition, the results of the study support the nursing literature which proclaims that positive teacher-student relationships are critical to effective teaching in both classroom and clinical settings. It is stated by King and Gerwig (1981) "Cognitive (or informative) teaching is one sided, inflexible, and limited in that it totally ignores affective aspects of learning....this type of autocratic education is dehumanizing to the learner and has had a dehumanizing effect on the entire practice of nursing" (p. vii).

A question significant to nursing has to do with the effects of the teacher-student relationship that are transferred to the student-patient relationship. Jourard (1971), for example, put forth the hypothesis that if nursing instructors disclosed themselves to students, students in turn would have more realistic role models with which to identify. The behaviour called the "bedside manner" would be abolished as the nurse learns, in part through the relationship with her instructor, how to be herself with patients (Jourard, 1971, p. 187).

In conclusion, the results of this study add to the growing body of literature in both education and nursing which supports the importance of a teacher developing positive relationships with students. More specifically, the results have implications for the field of research

pertaining to the assessment of the process dimension of teaching.

Further Research

In consideration of the conclusions and implications of the study, the following suggestions for further research are offered.

1. The study should be conducted with applicant nursing instructors with follow-up student and director ratings of those instructors hired.
2. The study could be repeated with samples drawn from other populations such as community college nursing faculty and nursing faculty teaching in baccalaureate nursing programs.
3. Further investigation is needed regarding Teacher Perceiver Interview low scoring and high scoring nursing instructor effects on such nursing student variables as attitude, self-concept, and achievement.
4. The present study should be replicated incorporating the following changes: (a)eliminate questions twelve and forty on the Student Questionnaire, (b)eliminate question twelve on the Administrator Questionnaire, and (c)include in the introductory statement, outlined in the Teacher Perceiver Interview Guide and given prior to each interview, that both classroom and clinical settings may be considered when responding to interview

questions.

5. Research needs to be conducted in the use of the Teacher Perceiver Interview as a tool to develop the teaching strengths of presently employed nursing instructors.
6. Of value would be research in the area of faculty selection comparing the use of the Teacher Perceiver Interview with conventional selection interviews or methods which attempt to determine the applicant's teaching philosophy and practice.

REFERENCES

Aarestad, J.S. Analysis of teacher selection/retention and student achievement as related to Selection Research Incorporated's Teacher Perceiver Interview (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International 1981, 41, 2841A.

Anastasi, A. Psychological testing (4th ed.). New York:Macmillan, 1976.

Anderson, R.L. The inter-instrument reliability of two interviewing sequences used by Selection Research Incorporated (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38, 2434A.

Archer, S.E., & Fleshman, R.P. Faculty role modeling. Nursing Outlook, 1981, 29, 586-589.

Armington, C.L. Student evaluation - threat or incentive. Nursing Outlook, 1972, 20, 789-792.

Aspy, D., & Roebuck, F. Kids don't learn from people they don't like. Amherst, Mass.: Human Resource Development Press, 1977.

Avila, D.L., Combs, A.W. & Purkey, W.W. The helping relationship sourcebook (2nd ed.). Toronto:Allyn & Bacon, 1977.

Barham, V.A. Identifying effective behaviors of the nursing instructor through critical incidents. Nursing Research, 1965, 14, 65-69.

Bayne, M.V., Parker, B., & Todd, A. The search committee process. Nursing Outlook, 1982, 30, 178-181.

Bonneau, L.R. An interview for selecting teachers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1956).

Dissertation Abstracts, 1957, 17, 537A.

Brown, R.I. An application of an individualized approach to staff development based on the Selection Research Incorporated model of development (Doctoral disseration, Ohio State University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 40, 203A.

Brown, S.T. Faculty and student perceptions of effective clinical teachers. Journal of Nursing Education, 1981, 20(9), 4-15.

Chalker, D.M. The Teacher Perceiver Interview as an instrument for predicting successful teaching behavior (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International. 1981, 42, 469-A.

Clifton, D.O., Hollingsworth, F.L., & Hall, W.E. A projective technique for measuring positive and negative attitudes towards people in a real-life situation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1952, 43, 273-283.

Coker, H., Lorentz, J., & Coker, J. The use of a structured interview to identify effective teachers. Unpublished manuscript, 1976. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska. 68508.

Combs, A.W. The human side of learning. National Elementary Principal, 1973, 52 (4), 38 - 42.

Cotanch, P.H. Self-actualization and professional socialization of nursing students in the clinical laboratory experience. Journal of Nursing Education, 1981, 20 (8), 4 - 14.

de Tournyay, R., & Thompson, M. Strategies for teaching nursing (2nd ed.). Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, 1982.

Dickerson, D.B. A personalized approach to preservice teacher development (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts

International, 1981, 42, 176 A.

Dixon, J.K., & Koerner, B. Faculty and student preceptions of effective classroom teaching in nursing. Nursing Research, 1976, 25, 300 - 305.

Dodge, G.W. Aptitude for positive teacher-pupil rapport (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1962). Dissertation Abstracts, 1963, 22, 4280 A.

Duppstadt, N.C. End-of-course evaluation by students. In National League for Nursing, Generating effective teaching, (Pub. No. 16-1749). New York: The League, 1978.

Ellis, R. Values and viscissitudes of the scientist nurse. Nursing Research, 1970, 19, 444.

Ferguson, G.A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education (4th ed.). Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Flanders, N.A., & Simon, A. Teacher effectiveness. In R.L. Ebel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research. New York: MacMillan, 1969.

Forrest, I.D. Student self-actualization, achievement, and perception of facilitative conditions in the student-teacher relationship. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1978.

Gaeddert, W. A study of student responses in a positive reference frame (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebreska, 1956). Dissertation Abstracts, 1957, 16, 706.

Goldsmid, C.A., Gruber, J.E., and Wilson, E.K. Perceived attributes of superior teachers: An inquiry into the giving of teacher awards. American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 14 (4), 423 - 440.

Gorman, A.H. Teachers and learners: the interactive process

of education. Boston:Allyn & Bacon, 1969.

Gunter, L.M. The developing nursing student: Part III, a study of self-appraisals and concerns reported during the sophomore year. Nursing Research, 1969, 18, 237 - 243.

Haefele, D.L. The Teacher Perceiver Interview: How valid? Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 683-684.

Hastings, J.M. Developing and implementing a tool for course evaluation by students. In National League for Nursing, Generating effective teaching, (Pub. No. 16-1749). New York: The League, 1978.

Hawken, P.L. Faculty recruitment - or after the advertisements. Nursing Outlook, 1979, 27, 420 - 422.

Jones, D.E. Predicting teaching processes with the Teacher Perceiver Interview. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 1958A.

Jourard, S.M. The transparent self. Toronto:Van Nostrand Reinhold, Ltd., 1971.

Karns, P.J. & Schwab, T.A. Therapeutic communication and clinical instruction. Nursing Outlook, 1982, 30 (1), 39 - 43.

Kerr, J. In defense of diploma nurses. Alberta Association of Registered Nurses Newsletter, 1982, 38 (1), 5.

Kiker, M. Characteristics of the effective teacher. Nursing Outlook, 1973, 21, 721 - 723.

King, V. and Gerwig, N. Humanizing nursing education: A confluent approach through group process. Wakefield, Mass. Nursing Resources, 1981.

Kunst-Wilson, W., Carpenter, L., Poser, A., Venohr, I., and Kushner, K. Empathic perceptions of nursing students: Self-reported and actual ability. Research in Nursing and Health, 1981, 4, 283 - 293.

Lieske, G.R. An interview process for selecting activating teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31, 109A.

Lombardo, M.C. Unique characteristics of diploma programs that contribute to effective teaching. In National League for Nursing, Concepts and components of effective teaching (Pub. No. 16-1750). New York: The League, 1978.

Marsh, H.W. The validity of students' evaluations of instructors independently nominated as best and worst teachers by graduating seniors. American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 14 (4), 441 - 447.

McKay, S.R. A review of student stress in nursing education programs. Nursing Forum, 1978, 17, 376 - 393.

Millard, J., & Brooks, R. Selection Research project evaluation: Joint county school systems of Polk and Story Counties Unpublished manuscript, 1974. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506.

Mims, F.H. Students evaluate faculty. Nursing Outlook, 1970, 18, 53 - 55.

Mitchell, P.M., & Loustau, A. Concepts basic to nursing (3rd ed.). Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Mufuka, J. An administrative tool for teaching effectiveness. In National League for Nursing, Generating effective teaching (Pub. No. 16-1749). New York: The League, 1978.

Muller, G.D. Alvernia High School statistical report concerning student ratings and the SRI Teacher Perceiver Interview. Unpublished manuscript, 1974. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506.

Muller, G.D. Teacher Perceiver Interview scores and ratings of students for a select sample of New Orleans public school teachers. Unpublished manuscript, 1976a. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506.

Muller, G.D. The effects of increased teacher talent in the St. Rita's schools: A three year study. Unpublished manuscript, 1976b. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506.

Muller, G.D. Technical data report for the Teacher Perceiver Interview: Houston Independent School District. Unpublished manuscript, 1977. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebreska 68506.

Muller, G.D. In defense of The Teacher Perceiver. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978a, 59, 684 - 685.

Muller, G.D. Teacher Perceiver technical report. Unpublished manuscript, 1978b. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506.

National League for Nursing. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness. New York: The League, 1977a.

National League for Nursing. Toward excellence in nursing education - a guide for diploma school improvement (Pub. No. 16-1656). New York: The League, 1977b.

O'Shea, H.S., and Parsons, M.K. Clinical instruction: effective and ineffective teacher behaviours. Nursing Outlook, 1979, 27, 411 - 415.

Pines, R. Don Quixote in the classroom. Clearing House, 1976, 50, 124 - 127.

Richardson, J.A., and Matheny, K.B. Teaching effectiveness: the science of the art. In National League for Nursing, Concepts and components of effective teaching (Pub. No. 16-1750). New York: The League, 1978.

Rogers, C.R. Freedom to learn. Columbus: C.E. Merrill, 1969.

Rosendahl, P.L. Effectiveness of empathy, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness on self-actualization of nursing students. Nursing Research, 1973, 22, 253 - 257.

Rosenshine, B. Recent research on teaching behaviours and student achievement. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27 (1), 61 - 64.

Rosenshine, B., & Furst, N. The use of direct observations to study teaching. In R. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Savage, H.W. The Teacher Perceiver Interview process. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1982.

Scheideman, J.M. Listening, a response to student protest. Nursing Outlook, 1973, 21, 789 - 792.

Schlotfeldt, R.M. Recruiting, appointing, and renewing faculty: A shared responsibility. Nursing Outlook, 1976, 24, 148 - 154.

Schmuck, R.A., & Schmuck, P.A. A humanistic psychology of education. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1974.

Schweer, J.E., Gebbie, K.M. Creative teaching in clinical nursing (3rd ed.). St. Louis: C.V. Mosby, 1976.

Selection Research Incorporated. Teacher Perceiver Interview Manual. Unpublished manuscript, 1977a. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506

Selection Research Incorporated. Technical characteristics of the Teacher Perceiver Interview with Washoe County school teachers. Unpublished manuscript, 1977b. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506.

Selection Research Incorporated. The effects of increased teacher talent in the St. Rita's schools: A fifth year follow up study. Unpublished manuscript, 1978a. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506.

Selection Research Incorporated. Houston validation study. Unpublished manuscript, 1978b. Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506.

Selection Research Incorporated. Minneapolis - St. Paul Archdiocese local validation and evaluation report. Unpublished manuscript, 1978c. Selection Reserach Incorportaed, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506.

Shavelson, R., & Dempsey-Atwood, N. Generalizability of measures of teaching behaviour. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46 (4), 553 - 611.

Shillig, E.J. The relationship between an innovative hiring technique and teacher performance ratings. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Akron, 1975.

Shingles, R.D. Faculty ratings: Procedures for interpreting student evaluations. American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 14 (4), 459 - 470.

Simmons, J.E. A study to test the Teacher Perceiver Interview as an instrument that would select vocational

agriculture instructors that develop positive rapport with their students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 38, 74A.

Smeltzer, C. The process of faculty evaluation. In National League for Nursing, Generating effective teaching (Pub. No. 16-1749). New York: The League, 1978.

Smith, D. The effects of values on clinical teaching. In J. Williamson (Ed.), Current perspectives in nursing research. St. Louis: Mosby, 1976.

Sobol, E.G. Self-actualiation and the Baccalaureate nursing student's response to stress. Nursing Research, 1978, 27, 239 - 243.

Stadler, K.A. Principles, process, and utilization of course evaluations by students. In National League for Nursing, Generating effective teaching (Pub. No. 16-1749). New York: The League, 1978.

Stein, R.F. The student nurse; a study of needs, roles and conflicts, part II. Nursing Research, 1969, 18, 433 - 440.

Trent, J.W., & Cohen, A.M. Research on teaching in higher education. In R. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Tyler, L.L. The concept of an ideal teacher-student relationship. Journal of Educational Research, 1964, 58, 112 - 117.

Ulich, R. (Ed). Three thousand years of educational wisdom. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Wallace, G.R. Effective teaching. In National League for Nursing, Concepts and components of effective teaching (Pub. No. 16-1750). New York: The League, 1978.

Warner, A.K. A structured interview for predicting future pupil-teacher rapport (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30, 1386 A.

Watson, I. Socialization of the nursing student in a professional nursing education programme. Nursing Papers, 1981, 13 (2), 19 - 24.

White, D.I. Teacher evaluation by coordinator and peers. In National League for Nursing, Generating effective teaching (Pub. No. 16-1749). New York: The League, 1978.

Wickless, A. Teacher evaluation by peers. In National League for Nursing, Generating effective teaching (Pub. No. 16-1749). New York: The League, 1978.

Winseman, A.W. An interview process for selecting activating vocational technical instructors (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 31, 243 A.

APPENDIX A: SRI STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The material appearing on page 113 has been removed because of unavailability of copyright permission. The material consisted of a copy of the SRI Teacher Perceiver Academy 7-A Student Questionnaire originally obtained from: Selection Research Incorporated, 2546 South 48 Street, Lincoln, Nebraska. 68506.

APPENDIX B: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (ADAPTED)

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

I am interested in how you feel about your nursing instructor. Please read each statement and decide which answer best describes how you feel.

If you strongly disagree, blacken A on the answer sheet.
If you disagree, blacken B on the answer sheet.
If you are undecided, blacken C on the answer sheet.
If you agree, blacken D on the answer sheet.
If you strongly agree, blacken E on the answer sheet.

Answer just the way you honestly feel. No instructor will see your answers. Your answers will be used for this study only. Thank you for your help.

1. This instructor acts like she believes I can learn.
2. This instructor makes me feel better when I make a mistake.
3. This instructor likes me.
4. This instructor knows what I am good at.
5. This instructor is easy to talk to.
6. This instructor acts like she wants me to succeed.
7. This instructor finds the answer for me if she does not know.
8. This instructor uses many different ways to help me learn.
9. This instructor encourages me to think of new ways to do things.
10. This instructor is understanding when I don't get my work done on time.
11. This instructor is fair.
12. This instructor will probably always be an instructor.

13. This instructor acts like she enjoys teaching.
14. This instructor knows how I feel.
15. This instructor acts like she thinks of me as a friend.
16. This instructor lets me work at my own rate.
17. This instructor really seems to enjoy listening to me.
18. This instructor is happy when I learn something.
19. This instructor has brought extra things to class/clinic.
20. This instructor makes me feel good when I try.
21. This instructor has a lot of new ideas.
22. This instructor always gets her work done on time.
23. This instructor listens to my side of the story.
24. This instructor has goals for herself.
25. This instructor knows what she is doing and why.
26. This instructor understands how it feels to be a student.
27. I like this instructor.
28. This instructor has taught me things that are important to me.
29. I have talked with this instructor about personal concerns.
30. This instructor does not give up on me.
31. This instructor always seems to be learning too.
32. This instructor laughs with us when we say something funny.
33. This instructor gives me new things to do.
34. This instructor is well organized.
35. This instructor does not jump to conclusions.

36. This instructor is trying to improve her teaching.
37. I respect this instructor.
38. It is easy to get help from this instructor.
39. I have learned a lot in this instructor's class.
40. I have many friends in this class.

Appendix C: SRI QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHER ADVOCATES

SRI Questionnaire for Teacher Advocates

Please answer each of the following questions about each of the teachers assigned to you. Use the following key:

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

1.	This teacher believes that students can learn.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2.	This teacher makes students feel better when they make a mistake.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3.	This teacher likes students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4.	This teacher knows what students are good at.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5.	The teacher is easy to talk to.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6.	This teacher acts like he/she wants students to succeed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7.	The teacher finds the answer for students when they need help.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8.	This teacher uses many different ways to help students learn.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9.	This teacher encourages students to think of new ways to do things.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10.	This teacher is understanding when students don't get work done on time.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11.	This teacher is fair.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12.	This teacher will probably always be a teacher.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13.	This teacher enjoys teaching.	SA	A	U	D	SD

14.	This teacher knows how students feel.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15.	This teacher thinks of students as friends.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16.	This teacher lets students work at their own speed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17.	This teacher really seems to enjoy listening to students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18.	This teacher is happy when students learn something.	SA	A	U	D	SD
19.	This teacher has brought extra things to school to help students learn.	SA	A	U	D	SD
20.	This teacher makes students feel good when they try.	SA	A	U	D	SD
21.	This teacher has a lot of new ideas.	SA	A	U	D	SD
22.	This teacher always gets his/her work done on time.	SA	A	U	D	SD
23.	This teacher listens to each student before responding.	SA	A	U	D	SD
24.	This teacher has goals for himself/herself.	SA	A	U	D	SD

APPENDIX D: DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE (ADAPTED)

DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions about each of the instructors assigned to you.

If you strongly disagree, blacken A on the answer sheet.
If you disagree, blacken B on the answer sheet.
If you are undecided, blacken C on the answer sheet.
If you agree, blacken D on the answer sheet.
If you strongly agree, blacken E on the answer sheet.

No instructor will see your answers. Your answers will be used for this study only.

Thank you for your help.

1. This instructor believes that students can learn.
2. This instructor makes students feel better when they make a mistake.
3. This instructor likes students.
4. This instructor knows what students are good at.
5. The instructor is easy to talk to.
6. This instructor acts like she wants students to succeed.
7. The instructor finds the answer for students when they need help.
8. This instructor uses many different ways to help students learn.
9. This instructor encourages students to think of new ways to do things.
10. This instructor is understanding when students don't get work done on time.
11. This instructor is fair.
12. This instructor will probably always be a teacher.
13. This instructor enjoys teaching.
14. This instructor knows how students feel.

15. This instructor thinks of students as friends.
16. This instructor lets students work at their own speed.
17. This instructor really seems to enjoy listening to students.
18. This instructor is happy when students learn something.
19. This instructor has brought extra things to class to help students learn.
20. This instructor makes students feel good when they try.
21. This instructor has a lot of new ideas.
22. This instructor always gets her work done on time.
23. This instructor listens to each student before responding.
24. This instructor has goals for herself.

APPENDIX E: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW

Correlation Coefficients Of Teacher Perceiver Interview To Totals And Ratings

Theme and Question Numbers	Correlation to Theme Total	TPI Total	Student Rating	Director Rating
Mission				
1	.46 ***	.28 *	.40 **	.19
13	.19	.05	-.10	-.21
25	.71 ***	.31 **	.11	.00
37	.58 ***	.22 *	.21	.01
49	.43 ***	.43 ***	.13	.32 **
Empathy				
2	.74 ***	.28 *	.03	.10
14	.52 ***	.13	-.08	.15
26	.57 ***	.17	-.01	-.10
38	.64 ***	.43 ***	.14	.11
50	.38 **	.09	.04	.11
Rapport Drive				
3	.55 ***	.34 **	.22	.01
15	.51 ***	.12	.17	.25 *
27	.61 ***	.33 **	.33 **	.24 *
39	.34 **	.35 **	-.01	.27 *
51	.27 *	.07	-.03	.12
Ind. Percept.				
4	.38 **	.08	.07	-.08
16	.51 ***	.28 *	.02	.17
28	.55 ***	.25 *	.16	.06
40	.25 *	.10	.16	.08
52	.41 **	.16	.18	.23 *
Listening				
5	.38 **	.20	-.11	.14
17	.61 ***	.24 *	.12	.12
29	.52 ***	.13	-.06	.17
41	.54 ***	.22	-.12	-.05
53	.51 ***	.43 ***	-.11	.23 *

Theme and Question Numbers	Correlation to Theme Total	TPI Total	Student Rating	Director Rating
Investment				
6	.42 ***	-.03	.04	.03
18	.45 ***	.19	.11	.07
30	.52 ***	.14	-.11	.08
42	.50 ***	-.37 **	-.14	-.12
54	.22	.19	.00	.14
Input Drive				
7	.63 ***	.29 *	.24 *	.12
19	.33 **	-.01	-.10	-.05
31	.63 ***	.43 ***	.15	.24 *
43	.47 ***	.23 *	-.01	.11
55	.58 ***	.49 ***	.37 **	.35 **
Activation				
8	.35 **	.29 *	.06	.13
20	.59 ***	.16	-.12	.14
32	.30 **	-.11	-.18	-.31 **
44	.51 ***	.42 ***	.22	.40 **
56	.61 ***	.43 ***	.17	.11
Innovation				
9	.51 ***	.36 **	-.08	-.02
21	.55 ***	.23 *	.21	.21
33	.55 ***	.23 *	.21	.21
45	.61 ***	.09	.00	-.02
57	.41 **	.21	-.12	.17
Gestalt				
10	.37 **	.15	.01	.01
22	.30 **	.32 **	.00	.13
34	.58 ***	.10	-.21	-.03
46	.50 ***	.27 *	-.11	.11
58	.44 ***	.15	.29 *	.18

Theme and Question Numbers	Correlation to Theme Total	TPI Total	Student Rating	Director Rating
Objectivity				
11	.64 ***	.44 ***	.08	.08
23	.47 ***	.16	-.03	-.19
35	.51 ***	.23 *	.25 *	.17
47	.51 ***	.29 **	.09	.15
59	.53 ***	.16	.16	.00
Focus				
12	.28 *	.00	.00	-.24 *
24	.36 **	.23 *	-.14	.11
36	.59 ***	.22	.18	.05
49	.41 **	.30 **	.03	.13
60	.67 ***	.24 *	.14	.13

* Significant beyond $p < .05$
** Significant beyond $p < .01$
*** Significant beyond $p < .001$

APPENDIX F: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Correlation Coefficients Of The Student Questionnaire
(N=1162)

Question Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation to Total
1	4.28	.85	.70
2	3.60	1.16	.68
3	3.89	.88	.73
4	3.83	.93	.68
5	3.92	1.19	.76
6	4.20	.91	.75
7	3.99	1.01	.60
8	3.73	.99	.67
9	3.82	.98	.64
10	3.36	1.08	.53
11	4.03	1.01	.74
12	3.40	1.17	.21
13	4.03	1.00	.71
14	3.50	1.07	.72
15	3.43	1.11	.68
16	3.80	.93	.55
17	3.67	.99	.74
18	4.07	.79	.69
19	3.66	1.10	.59

Appendix F (continued)

Question Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation to Total
20	4.01	.93	.79
21	3.64	1.00	.65
22	3.69	1.10	.43
23	3.95	.90	.71
24	4.02	.86	.59
25	4.20	.87	.67
26	3.81	1.11	.73
27	4.15	1.06	.83
28	4.04	.97	.74
29	3.04	1.35	.49
30	4.00	.84	.73
31	3.85	.95	.63
32	4.22	.88	.66
33	3.90	.90	.65
34	3.83	1.12	.49
35	3.76	1.02	.67
36	3.89	.96	.69
37	4.22	.98	.80
38	4.01	1.09	.79
39	4.01	1.04	.72
40	4.23	.80	.26

APPENDIX G: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Correlation Coefficients Of The Director Questionnaire
(N=48)

Question Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation To Total
1	4.47	.54	.70
2	4.04	.77	.60
3	4.52	.54	.67
4	4.10	.85	.71
5	4.06	.95	.64
6	4.33	.69	.79
7	4.12	.53	.25
8	3.83	.90	.75
9	3.83	.78	.66
10	3.70	1.03	.68
11	4.39	.64	.72
12	3.25	.88	.25
13	4.31	.74	.88
14	4.02	.81	.78
15	3.29	1.11	.68
16	3.62	.64	.44
17	4.08	.82	.80
18	4.41	.57	.78
19	3.91	.76	.66

Table 19 (continued)

Question Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	To Total
20	4.29	.77	.82
21	3.72	1.06	.67
22	4.12	1.00	.57
23	4.00	.94	.84
24	4.25	1.10	.77

APPENDIX H: TABULATION OF NURSING INSTRUCTOR RESPONSE TO TEACHER PERCEIVER INTERVIEW

Tabulation of Nursing Instructor Response to
Teacher Perceiver Interview

1. Relaxed during interview; questions thought-provoking.
2. Liked the interview; made me think and explore my ideas about teaching.
3. Great to express my own views; the non-threatening questions made me think about myself and my teaching.
4. The questions were interesting.
5. Comfortable in interview; questions made me think about my teaching.
6. Questions were interesting and made me think; unsure whether to answer the question keeping in mind large group classroom teaching or small group clinical teaching.
7. An enjoyable experience that gave me opportunity to explore values, strengths, and weaknesses of myself as a teacher; good time of year to do the interview.
8. The interview was great; it helped me look at myself and my teaching and reinforced why I am here; some questions were hard and point out that we don't analyze our teaching as we should.
9. The interview was non-threatening and dealt with pertinent issues; I was unsure whether the questions referred to clinical or classroom teaching.
10. The questions were thought-provoking and helped me redefine what is important in my teaching and to recognize that I like what I do.
11. Relaxed atmosphere and an enjoyable experience; the questions were very relevant and very real to my teaching situation.
12. The questions were interesting and they seem important to good teaching; I learned something here.
13. The interview was non-threatening; the questions were relevant and the situations realistic to everyday practice; it was good to share my thoughts about

teaching.

14. I felt very relaxed in the interview; it was a unique reflection of how I see teaching and myself as a teacher -- really an evaluation of my teaching.

15. The questions were thought-provoking, relevant, and whetted my appetite for more.

16. I felt good about the interview.

17. Would like to think alot more about some of the questions.

18. The interview was enjoyable; the questions made me think.

19. The questions were good ones; it was good to talk about my ideas.

20. The interview was non-threatening; I responded as a clinician rather than as a teacher.

21. I enjoyed the interview; it gave me the opportunity to put into words some ideas I have that I haven't shared before; also helped me reevaluate my goals and philosophy of teaching.

22. I enjoyed the interview; the questions were pertinent and related to my experience as a teacher.

23. I liked the interview; I was not sure whether to refer to clinical or classroom teaching when responding to some of the questions.

24. The interview was non-threatening and the questions interesting.

25. I enjoyed the questions and the opportunity to reflect on my teaching.

26. The questions were thought-provoking; I had to think about which context - clinical or classroom - was most applicable to the questions.

27. I found the questions relevant and realistic to my experience.

28. The questions were real and relevant.

29. Some of the questions I had thought about before but others were very thought-provoking for me.

30. The interview was a comfortable experience and most questions were pertinent to my experience.

31. This was a good experience; the questions were appropriate to my situations.

32. I found the interview non-threatening and the questions good ones.

33. I liked the interview; the questions were good but I was not sure what response was wanted.

34. I enjoyed answering these questions--they were interesting.

35. I found the questions thought-provoking and the interview comfortable.

36. The questions made me think about myself as a teacher; they were interesting questions.

37. A useful and pleasant experience; the good questions made me think about my teaching.

38. I found some of the questions hard at the beginning; was very aware of the microphone.

39. I felt sort of uncomfortable when a question could not be clarified; the questions were thought-provoking though many I had not thought about before.

40. I enjoyed the interview and the questions because it gave me the chance to articulate my ideas and think about what I do.

41. A very worthwhile experience to deal with such thought-provoking questions.

42. As a new teacher, I have encountered some of those situations in the interview and there are other situations described that I think I will encounter in time; the questions helped me clarify my thoughts about myself and my teaching.

43. The questions were good ones and covered a wide area of beliefs and practice related to teaching.

44. The questions are ones I like to talk about--that I believe are important.

45. The questions are clear and thought-provoking.

46. I could put myself into the situations in the interview very easily.

47. This was an opportunity to verbalize my philosophy and actions--a useful experience.

48. The questions were good in helping me analyze what I am doing and why; it has provided a focus for the future.

APPENDIX I: CONSENT FORMS FOR INSTRUCTORS, DIRECTORS, AND STUDENTS

INSTRUCTOR CONSENT FORM

This is to certify that I, _____ ____ consent to participate in a research project on teaching effectiveness being conducted by Darle Forrest, R.N., doctoral student at the University of Alberta.

It is my understanding that:

1) I will participate with the investigator in a tape-recorded interview approximately one hour in length.

2) The taped interview and information received will remain confidential and names anonymous.

3) Students and director (or coordinator) will each complete a questionnaire regarding their perceptions of my teaching.

4) I am free to ask questions about the study and have them answered to my satisfaction.

5) I may refrain from answering any questions and may withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

Signature: _____

Witness: _____

Date: _____

DIRECTOR/COORDINATOR CONSENT FORM

This is to certify that I, _____ consent to participate in a research project on teaching effectiveness being conducted by Darle Forrest, R.N., doctoral student at the University of Alberta.

It is my understanding that:

1) I will complete a questionnaire on each nursing instructor participating in the study provided she has given her consent that I may do so.

2) The information I provide will remain confidential with the investigator and my name anonymous.

3) I am free to ask questions about the study and have them answered to my satisfaction.

4) I may choose to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

Signature: _____

Witness: _____ _____

Date: _____

STUDENT CONSENT FORM

This is to certify that I, _____ _____ consent to participate in a research project on teaching effectiveness being conducted by Darle Forrest, R.N., doctoral student at the Univeristy of Alberta.

It is my understanding that:

1) I will complete a questionnaire on one or more of the nursing instructors who have taught me.

2) The information I provide will remain confidential with the investigator and my name anonymous.

3) I am free to ask questions about the study and have them answered to my satisfaction.

4) I may choose to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.